

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY



Volume 19

Number 4

October 1945

- The Agricultural History Society's First Quarter Century
Arthur G. Peterson 193
- The Origin of the Land Speculator as a Frontier Type
Ray Allen Billington 204
- The Agricultural Development of Lower Canada, 1850-1867
Robert Leslie Jones 212
- Finnish Overseas Emigration from Arctic Norway and Russia
John Ilmari Kolehmainen 224
- Godkin Looks at Western Agrarianism: A Case Study
William A. Russ, Jr. 233
- The General Records of the United States Department of Agriculture
in the National Archives
Guy A. Lee 242
- The Influence of Woodrow Wilson on Frederick Jackson Turner
Wendell H. Stephenson 249
- Pehr Kalm's Observations Concerning the Usefulness of the American
So-Called Cockspur Hawthorn for Quickset Hedges
Esther Louise Larsen 254
- News Notes and Comments 256

Published Quarterly

by

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

Published Quarterly by the Agricultural History Society

Agricultural History is designed as a medium for the publication of research and documents pertaining to the history of agriculture in all its phases and as a clearing house for information of interest and value to workers in the field. Materials on the history of agriculture in all countries are included, and also materials on institutions, organizations, and sciences which have been factors in agricultural development. The Agricultural History Society assumes no responsibility for statements, whether of fact or of opinion, made by contributors.

Agricultural History is sent to members of the Agricultural History Society. Student membership, \$1.50 for bona fide students 18-25 years old; annual, \$3.00; contributing, \$10.00; life, for a sum in dollars equal to 100 less age of applicant at last birthday; joint membership with the Economic History Association, \$5.00, the member receiving the semi-annual *Journal of Economic History* as well as *Agricultural History*.

Correspondence concerning contributions, books for review, and back numbers may be sent to Everett E. Edwards, editor, Agricultural History Society, Room 3901, South Agriculture Building, Washington 25, D. C.; correspondence concerning membership dues and business matters to the secretary-treasurer, Charles A. Burmeister, at the same address.

Entered as second-class matter, October 12, 1928, at the post office at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Officers and Executive Committee of the Society

President: CHARLES J. BRAND, Economic Consultant, 1111 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.

Vice President: RICHARD O. CUMMINGS, University of California, Los Angeles

Secretary-Treasurer: CHARLES A. BURMEISTER, U. S. Department of Agriculture

HARRY J. CARMAN, Columbia University

CLARENCE H. DANHOF, Lehigh University

JAMES C. MALIN, University of Kansas

ARTHUR G. PETERSON, War Department

WARREN C. WAITE, University of Minnesota

CARL R. WOODWARD, Rhode Island State College

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY'S FIRST QUARTER CENTURY

ARTHUR G. PETERSON

The Army Industrial College, War Department

The Agricultural History Society was organized at the Cosmos Club in Washington, D. C., on February 14, 1919.¹ The archives of the society are fairly complete since then—thanks largely to Everett E. Edwards—but no records have been found dealing with what preceded the organization meeting. Fortunately the two survivors of the five organizers, namely Lyman Carrier and O. C. Stine, are still active men with good memories. Since they are in substantial agreement, their recollections about the formation of the society have been accepted.

Rodney H. True of the Bureau of Plant Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture was the prime mover in the organization of the society. He had been recognized by librarians and others as an authority on agricultural history for several years prior to the formation of the society.²

The first two meetings were held in the west wing of the Department of Agriculture Administration Building. No program was attempted at the first meeting, but at the second meeting a month later, Lyman Carrier read a paper on John Mitchell and the authorship of *American Husbandry*.³

Before proceeding to the meeting at which the society was organized, let us look at some developments that helped to set the stage for the formation of the society. The Carnegie Institution of Washington in 1904 outlined a group of projects dealing with "Contributions to American Economic History." The project relating to agricultural history for some time was under the direction of Kenyon L. Butterfield, then president

of Rhode Island State College. A good deal of the preparatory work on the agricultural history project was done at the University of Wisconsin by Henry C. Taylor, John I. Falconer, L. C. Gray, O. E. Baker, O. C. Stine, William J. Trimble, L. G. Conner, and others.

Arrangements were made in 1913 for John I. Falconer to prepare a manuscript on northern agriculture from 1840 to 1860, which became his Ph. D. thesis. In Washington, L. G. Conner had been doing some work on agricultural history during 1912-1914 for W. J. Spillman of the Office of Farm Management. In 1915 Spillman sent Conner to carry on some agricultural history work at Wisconsin for about a year. Conner's *A Brief History of the Sheep Industry in the United States* was completed in 1918 and published by the American Historical Association in its annual report for that year and in the first volume of the Agricultural History Society's *Papers* (1921).

Henry C. Taylor succeeded Kenyon L. Butterfield in directing the project on agricultural history in 1916 and became chief of the Office of Farm Management in Washington in 1919. During the course of World War I, Stine and Baker worked in the Department of Agriculture. William J. Trimble of North Dakota Agricultural College and R. W. Kelsey of Haverford College were also in Washington early in 1919. Trimble was largely responsible for the affiliation of the Agricultural History Society with the American Historical Association which provided for publication of the early papers of the society. Thus the stage was well set for the formal organization of the Agricultural History Society in February 1919.⁴

¹ This article was presented in part as the presidential address at the annual meeting of the Agricultural History Society in Washington, D. C., on June 18, 1945.

² Lyman Carrier, Blacksburg, Va., to Arthur G. Peterson, May 22, 1943. See also "Rodney H. True and His Writings," *Agricultural History*, 18:23-34 (January 1944).

³ Carrier to Peterson, May 22, 1943; Rodney H. True, Philadelphia, to O. C. Stine, May 9, 1934.

⁴ Percy W. Bidwell of Yale University, an authority on New England agriculture, spent over a year with the Carnegie Institution of Washington in 1922-23. The book by Bidwell and John I. Falconer, *History of Agriculture in the Northern United States, 1620-1860*, was published by the Carnegie Institution in May 1925. See especially its Introductory Note, p. v-vi. The notable companion work by L. C. Gray on *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860* was published in 1933.

A meeting was called at the Cosmos Club assembly room, Washington, D. C., for February 14, 1919 by the American Historical Association to which all those interested in the history of agriculture were invited. The meeting was called to order by J. F. Jameson, a member of the council of the association. Rodney H. True was elected to preside at the meeting. William J. Trimble presented a paper on "The Great Surplus Period, 1862 to 1902." The chairman, True, was directed to choose four persons to aid him in presenting a plan of organization. After a recess the committee of five presented a proposed constitution, which was duly adopted. The five committee members were then elected to the five offices as follows: president, Rodney H. True, Bureau of Plant Industry; vice president, William J. Trimble, North Dakota Agricultural College; secretary-treasurer, Lyman Carrier, Bureau of Plant Industry; elected members of the executive committee, R. W. Kelsey, Haverford College, and O. C. Stine, Office of Farm Management.⁵

In the original constitution the articles with respect to object, officers, meetings, charter membership, and amendments are substantially the same as today. Some of the original articles seem to have been of mid-Victorian vintage and apparently had their genesis in social or honorary fraternities. For instance, Article IV provided that applicants for membership "... shall have been recommended by two members and elected by a majority vote of the Executive Committee." Article XI specified that "Any one whose membership has lapsed for the nonpayment of dues may be reinstated to full membership by the Executive Committee on the payment of all arrears." These provisions have been dropped from the constitution and bylaws. Moreover it is unlikely that they were ever observed.

Article III provided in part that "The charter members of this society shall consist of those who pay their dues and sign this Constitution prior to March 15, 1919." Ninety-three signatures appear on the constitution as adopted in 1919. Although they did not sign the constitution, thirty-four others have long been considered charter members as the records indicate that they became members by March 15, 1919. If we accept what seems to have been the spirit rather than the

letter as to prerequisites for charter membership, the total is 127, of whom but 14 are still members of the society.⁶

The society was organized "To stimulate interest, promote the study and facilitate the publication of researches in the history of agriculture."⁷ Its first activities were a series of dinner meetings on March 10, April 4, May 12, 1919, and January 26, 1920. These meetings (evidenced by printed invitations) were held on the second floor of Cushman's Restaurant at 607 Fourteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C., a site long since occupied by the Eastman Kodak store. One or two papers were read at each of these monthly meetings.

The first of the annual joint sessions with the American Historical Association was held at Cleveland, Ohio, on December 29-30, 1919, with seven papers relating to agricultural history.

The second annual meeting was held in the committee room of the Department of Interior Building on March 1, 1920. All officers were reelected for a second term except that Percy W. Bidwell succeeded R. W. Kelsey on the executive committee. Although Marjorie F. Warner of the Bureau of Plant Industry was the nominating committee's choice for secretary-treasurer, Lyman Carrier was reelected. This is the only case to date where the nominating committee has not picked all the officers for the ensuing year. Here seemed to be *prima facie* evidence of an election conflict. However, according to Carrier, Miss Warner "flatly refused" to serve as secretary-treasurer.⁸ Incidentally Miss Warner, who retired from her library work some years ago, is not only a charter member, but has been a faithful contributing member for many years and is now a life member.

The memorandum of agreement on affiliation with the American Historical Association was adopted at the second annual meeting, March 1, 1920, and the president was directed to appoint a publications committee. The one really significant provision in the agreement was as follows: "It is further agreed that a minimum of 300 pages in the Annual Report of the American Historical Association be allotted to the Agri-

⁶ For a list of the charter members, see page 202.

⁷ This phrase is from the constitution adopted on Feb. 14, 1919. For the present revised wording, see page 202.

⁸ Carrier to Peterson, May 22, 1943.

⁵ Agricultural History Society, Minutes of the First Annual Meeting. For a chronological list of the executive officers, 1919-1944, see page 203.

cultural History Society, with the full autonomy to act in the choice of material for that report, subject to the approval of the Committee on Publications of the American Historical Association and of the proper officials of the Smithsonian Institution." Three volumes of *Agricultural History Society Papers* were published under this arrangement before the agreement was discontinued in 1926.

Monthly meetings were held on April 8, June 3, and December 16, 1920 in the Public Library at Eighth and K Streets, N. W., Washington.

The president was directed on December 16, 1920 to appoint a committee of three to organize a Washington, D. C., local section of the Agricultural History Society. The appointees were John A. Saul, Nils A. Olsen, and Claribel R. Barnett.

The second joint session with the American Historical Association was held at the Willard Hotel in Washington on December 29, 1920. The printed program of the Agricultural History Society included a note stating that "An Exhibit of the Work of the Division of Agricultural History of the Office of Farm Management will be on display."

The joint sessions with the American Historical Association have been held since 1919. Among the activities of the Agricultural History Society these joint sessions rank almost with its annual meetings. Since they have been a regular annual event, no further mention of them will be made in this report except in special circumstances.

The first meeting of the Washington section of the Agricultural History Society was held on February 4, 1921 in the Public Library, and Claribel R. Barnett was elected secretary. "On motion and after considerable discussion it was voted that a committee of three on Agricultural History Museums be appointed." O. C. Stine, George K. Holmes, and F. L. Lewton were appointed. The Washington section held three other meetings in 1921, on April 28, May 26 and November 22.

The annual meeting of the society in 1921 was held on March 25 at the Public Library. At that time the constitution was amended to include all ex-presidents on the executive committee.

The plant pathologists and agronomists supplied the first president and secretary-treasurer. Many of the members in the early years of the society were from these groups, owing in no small part to the promotional efforts of Rodney H. True.

Economists were relatively scarce at that time, whereas today they seem to be everywhere. The

number and influence of economists in the Agricultural History Society increased considerably from 1921 to 1939 when they constituted the largest group in the society. Most of the agricultural economists who joined in 1939 were personal friends of the writer who was then the new secretary-treasurer. Quite a few of these new members later left the Department of Agriculture, shifted their interests to various war activities, and discontinued their membership in the society. Professional historians are again (June 14, 1945) the largest group in our membership with 89, whereas economists are second with about 69.

A questionnaire was circulated by the society (apparently in 1921) to universities, colleges, and experiment stations to ascertain the names of students engaged in the study of agricultural history, the subjects of their study, and the location and nature of their source material. The returns were reported to have been "quite gratifying." A few courses were then being given in agricultural history, but there was general complaint over the lack of suitable textbooks on agricultural history.

Herbert A. Kellar, O. C. Stine, and Nils A. Olsen, on September 11, 1922, entered into a written contract with the Century Company to write a book on "A History of American Agriculture, or similar title." This agreement was later cancelled by mutual consent, and the proposed history was not written.

A joint session with the American Farm Economic Association was suggested as early as 1922, but it was not until 1936 that such a meeting was held.

The last recorded meeting of the Washington section of the society was held on January 13, 1922.

The annual meeting in 1922 was held on March 10 at the Arts Club, 2017 Eye Street, N. W., Washington. A paper on "Food Control during Forty-Six Centuries: A Contribution to the History of Price Fixing" was presented by Mary G. Lacy, librarian of the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates. O. C. Stine presented five propositions relating to museums.

As president of the society, Herbert A. Kellar on May 20, 1922 appointed committees on publications, programs, membership, participation of the society in the Sesquicentennial Exposition of Philadelphia in 1926, agricultural surveys, archives, and fields of research. Participation in the exposition was later found not feasible.

The growing need for a journal was discussed at the 1923 annual meeting. The concensus was that such a journal should be independent of the United States Department of Agriculture and of uncertain congressional appropriations. A proposal to increase annual dues to \$3.00 from \$1.00 was defeated, but the following new memberships were adopted: sustaining, \$5.00; life, \$100; patron, \$1,000. Among the ways and means of getting funds the suggestion was to find a man of wealth to endow the society with 75 to 100 thousand dollars. We are still looking for such an angel. F. L. Lewton reported that the National Museum was ready to receive suitable exhibit material as soon as offered. Nils A. Olsen, the secretary-treasurer, presented what apparently was the first record of minutes and progress that amounted to anything. He reported \$129 received as dues, indicating that there were 129 members, or 2 more than in 1919.

June 6, 1924 was a big day for the Agricultural History Society. The society was incorporated that day in the District of Columbia as a non-profit organization at a cost of 95 cents.⁹ The six incorporators in the order of their signatures were: W. J. Spillman, Nils A. Olsen, Mary G. Lacy, Donald Jackson, O. C. Stine, and W. W. Stockberger.

The Honorable Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, attended the annual dinner meeting on June 6, 1924 and according to the record "... gave an intimate and admirable account of the development and influence of the agricultural press, with particular reference to the journalistic activities of the Wallace family in the state of Iowa."

The need for an agricultural history journal had been recognized from the early days of the society. In 1922 a committee on publications was created with O. C. Stine as chairman. Some thought was given to having a combined publication with the *Journal of Farm Economics*. On January 21, 1925, Herbert A. Kellar presented a 9-page report on "Suggestions Concerning the Proposed Journal of the Agricultural History Society."

Apparently a good many of the society's records of the 1920s were lost or destroyed. Little information is available on membership at that

time. Nils A. Olsen, the secretary-treasurer, estimated that the society in 1924 had about 200 members, 150 of whom were considered as active. Perhaps "active" meant that they paid dues. Herbert A. Kellar, the secretary-treasurer in 1925, estimated that the society had about 200 members of whom 110 were "local," which apparently meant the Washington, D. C., area.

Early in 1925 Rodney H. True tried to interest some of the wealthy members of the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Agriculture in establishing a fund or foundation for the publication of a journal on agricultural history. However, True finally admitted in a letter of January 4, 1939 to Russell H. Anderson that his efforts to obtain financial aid from this source had failed.

At the 1925 annual meeting a proposal to have separate officers for secretary and for treasurer was rejected. A motion to increase membership dues to \$2.00 beginning January 1926 was adopted.

The officials failed to arrange for an annual meeting or election in 1926. The officers who had been elected on June 5, 1925 held over until an election was finally held in September 1927.

A number of important events occurred in 1927. First and foremost was the launching of the periodical, *Agricultural History*, the society's journal with O. C. Stine as editor. Volume 1, Number 1, although dated January 1927, was not issued until April. However, not all issues since then have been late, and seldom have any been three months late. This first number is a thin one with but one article which was reprinted from the *North Carolina Historical Review* of January 1927 at a cost of only \$35.04.

The American Historical Association early in 1927 insisted on publishing only abstracts of papers read at joint sessions with the Agricultural History Society. This, along with the fact that the association's publications were several years behind made an Agricultural History Society journal all the more necessary at that time.

Volume 1, Number 2, of *Agricultural History* was published as of July 1927 at a cost of \$120, plus \$8 for reprints. Only two numbers were issued in 1927, whereas four numbers have been issued each year since then.

At the meeting on September 13, 1927, Rodney H. True, the first president, again became pres-

⁹ District of Columbia, Office of the Recorder of Deeds, Certificate of Incorporation No. 17524.

ident,¹⁰ and O. C. Stine began his 12-year term as the fourth secretary-treasurer.

Herbert A. Kellar in his last report as secretary-treasurer reported \$539.67 in the treasury. A count late in 1927 indicated 194 members, of whom 64 were in the United States Department of Agriculture. At that time there were only 18 library members compared with 189 at present (June 18, 1945). At this 1927 meeting were two newcomers to Washington, two farm boys from Minnesota: Everett E. Edwards and Arthur G. Peterson.

The executive committee, on October 28, 1927, held a meeting in President True's office at the University of Pennsylvania, with True, L. C. Gray, O. C. Stine, and R. W. Kelsey present. Everett E. Edwards, although not a member of the committee, attended this meeting. At that time the committee decided to hold 50 complete sets of *Agricultural History* in reserve and to give authors 50 reprints free. The latter policy was discontinued in 1938.

A letter telling about the society and its journal was sent by the "Editor and Secretary" to about 200 libraries shortly before the annual meeting in 1928. Carlton R. Ball, chairman of the auditing committee on May 8, 1928 returned the treasurer's report with fifteen suggested improvements and a proposed form for such a report.

An editorial board was created in 1928 and the members thereof have been listed on the cover of *Agricultural History* beginning with the issue of October 1928. Apparently no formal action was taken to provide for such a board in the constitution or bylaws of the society. It has been in the nature of an unofficial honorary group.

The editorial board has functioned on a limited scale, especially in the criticism and evaluation of articles and the determination of editorial policy.

¹⁰ In 1929 the nominating committee selected Rodney H. True as the candidate for vice president, thinking it was selecting Alfred Charles True, author of *A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785-1923* (Washington, 1928), *A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785-1925* (Washington, 1929), and *A History of Agricultural Experimentation and Research in the United States, 1607-1925* (Washington, 1937). Soon after the committee submitted its slate, Alfred Charles True died. Hence Rodney H. True remained the nominee and became vice president on April 29, 1929.

However, some members have been helpful in getting articles for the journal. The membership of the board has been changed occasionally upon recommendation of the editor and approval by the executive committee. The last major change was made in 1942.

E. Merton Coulter, although not a member of the society, was nominated for president in 1929. He then became a member, was elected president, and has been a loyal and valuable member ever since. At the annual meeting in 1929 a motion was adopted to increase membership dues from \$2.00 to \$3.00 beginning January 1930.

Herbert A. Kellar, a member of the nominating committee, wired Nils A. Olsen, chairman of the committee, on April 7, 1930 as follows: "Dear Olsen Think as long as Department of Agriculture people control journal and Secretary Treasurer office best for reasons of policy that President should come from historical group." Kellar perhaps referred to members outside the Washington area.

The secretary-treasurer reported \$1.58 on hand as of March 31, 1930. The financial reports of this period were usually limited to a summary of receipts, disbursements, and cash on hand, without showing liabilities and prepaid dues. The membership count was listed as 317 of whom 60 were employed in the Department of Agriculture in Washington. However, this count of 317 represented the total mailing list, including exchanges and "members" long delinquent in their dues.¹¹

On May 14, 1931, Stine wrote to Joseph Schafer, then president of the society, asking to be relieved of the editorship of *Agricultural History*, and suggesting that Everett E. Edwards be made editor. Edwards, who had been listed as assistant editor since 1928, thus became editor in name as well as fact when he wrote Schafer accepting the editorship on September 17, 1931.

Agricultural History, the quarterly journal, has been the outstanding contribution of the Agri-

¹¹ In April 1931 a life membership was sold to the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Agriculture for \$100. The sale of a life membership to an organization in perpetuity at a price based on the life expectancy of mortal man seemed inappropriate. As secretary-treasurer the writer requested that this life membership be made contingent upon the life of some individual, and the matter was mutually arranged on that basis between the contracting parties.

cultural History Society. Approximately 250 articles were published in the journal from 1927 to 1944 inclusive. In the years since 1928, Edwards has put his heart and soul into the journal and has made it a periodical of recognized merit. During the years of debt liquidation, the quality of the journal helped to offset what it sometimes lacked in quantity.

In May 1931 the secretary-treasurer reported \$176.72 in the bank and no outstanding debt. Apparently the \$300 that had been accumulated in the life membership fund was used to pay the debts and operating expenses. Thirty members were reported as having been "dropped from the roll, some being charter members who had not paid dues since the Society was organized. . . ."

In 1932 the secretary-treasurer reported that all members who had not paid dues since 1924 had been dropped, leaving 325 members as of April 1, 1932. This count included 14 exchanges and what may be considered as former members who were delinquent for as much as 8 years. A careful check of receipts throughout the 10-year period, 1931-40, indicates that only 237 members ever paid dues for 1932.

Two notable members died in 1931-32: W. J. Spillman and Frederick Jackson Turner.

The secretary-treasurer reported cash assets of \$9.34 as of April 30, 1934. A check of the financial situation at that time indicates that the October 1933 journal was but partly paid for and the January and April 1934 issues were not paid for although \$413.75 had been collected on 1934 dues.

The Honorable Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, addressed a joint session of the Agricultural History Society and the American Historical Association at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C., on December 27, 1934. About 400 attended this luncheon meeting.

The first joint session of the Agricultural History Society and the American Farm Economic Association was held at Chicago on December 28, 1936.

The society met at the residence (1615 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.) of Gifford Pinchot, former Governor of Pennsylvania, on April 15, 1937. Pinchot gave an address on "How Conservation Began in the United States."¹² The business session of the annual meeting was held the following evening in the South Building of the Department of Agriculture. The secretary-

treasurer reported 301 members in 1937, but only 246 had paid current or back dues.

The Columbia University Press on December 28, 1937 submitted a "Proposal for the publication of *Agricultural History*. . . ." This proposal was initiated by Harry J. Carman of Columbia University, an active member and friend of the Agricultural History Society, who knew of the accumulated debt that the society had incurred in publishing its journal. President M. L. Wilson in January 1938 transmitted the proposal to the executive committee. Rodney H. True, Herbert A. Kellar, Russell H. Anderson, Frederick Merk, et al., saw insufficient advantage in the proposal and expressed their disapproval. Consequently the proposal was tabled indefinitely. In True's reply of February 10, 1938 to Wilson were some interesting comments, as follows: "As one of the charter members of the Society, I must agree that the development of the Society has not reached the expectations that were held by the founders. . . . I belong to the old school that believes in paying as one goes—a doctrine somewhat out of style now. If we adopted the old philosophy, we could reduce the Journal to such an expense basis as could support it. . . ."

Three evening meetings were held in 1938 in Room 1039, South Building, Department of Agriculture, under the sponsorship of Agricultural History Society members in and near Washington. C. J. Galpin addressed a meeting on February 8, A. B. Graham and J. Phil Campbell on March 25, and Herbert A. Smith on April 19.

No annual meeting was held in 1938 as in 1926. However, new officers were elected by mailed ballots. The secretary-treasurer reported 327 "members" on April 1, 1938 compared with 295 a year earlier, when 301 had been reported.¹³ The enlarged journal and the large deficit spending in 1937-38 seem to have reflected an acceptance by some of the New Deal philosophy of spending into prosperity. The secretary-treasurer reported a bank balance as of March 31, 1938 of \$3.64 and said, "We owe Waverly Press \$1,457.36 as of this date." He appealed to the executive committee

¹³ The annual reports on net changes in membership overstate increases or understate decreases owing to several downward revisions in the membership count of a year earlier. The number of exchanges can be ascertained from the records, but the inclusion of many delinquents makes it difficult to get an accurate picture of the number and trend in membership.

¹² *Agricultural History*, 11:255-265 (October 1937).

for help and suggestions regarding the society's debt.

The society has given intermittent attention to the idea of an agricultural museum. This attention has been characterized by considerable talk and little effective action. Aiding in establishing a national museum and regional or state museums of agriculture probably is one of the chief contributions that the society may make. Let us hope, therefore, that after the present war the time will be ripe and that some man of action will arise to lead a successful agricultural museum project in the United States. Unfortunately, a good opportunity was lost a few years ago when a national museum of agriculture was not chosen as the Thomas Jefferson memorial in Washington, D. C.

As early as June 1919 Herbert A. Kellar prepared a 25-page report on a proposed museum to portray the development of harvesting machinery.¹⁴ Later he suggested that the Society prepare and publish a guide for local, regional, and national agricultural museums.¹⁵

Reference already has been made to the committee on agricultural history museums established by the Washington section of the Agricultural History Society in February 1921. A report of that committee dated March 15, 1921 contains some interesting remarks and recommendations as follows: "There is not at our National Capital any exhibit representing the agriculture of the nation. In the National Museum we find transportation, mining, manufacturing, and war represented on a grand scale, but agriculture, the support of all other arts and industries, is not represented at all."¹⁶ This statement is as appropriate today as in 1921 and more appropriate than in the latter part of the nineteenth century when there was an agricultural museum in the Department of Agriculture in Washington.

The committee recommended, among other things, "That the Agricultural History Society take some action to encourage or to assist in establishing, building up, and maintaining in Washington, D. C. an agricultural exhibit illustrating the progress of agriculture, including aboriginal agriculture, in the Continental United

States" and "That the Agricultural History Society offer to cooperate with the Smithsonian Institution in any manner and to the extent deemed proper, in collecting valuable materials relating to agricultural history, and in selecting and arranging an Agricultural History exhibit."

The National Grange at its seventy-second annual meeting in Portland, Oregon, in 1938 discussed the idea of a diamond jubilee celebration in 1941 and the erection of a suitable building, probably in Washington, D. C., where the Grange was founded; such building to contain, among other things, a historical museum and library.

M. L. Wilson, then Under Secretary of Agriculture, discussed the idea with L. J. Taber of the Grange, and others. Early in 1939 Wilson suggested reviving the idea of a Temple of Agriculture, to include offices for national farm organizations and the Agricultural History Society, an auditorium for agricultural conferences, and an agricultural museum. With the aid of farm organizations and the precedent of Federal grants for the National Museum, it was felt that Congress might appropriate funds for a building and a museum.

The annual meeting of the Agricultural History Society in May 1939 was devoted largely to the museum topic. C. A. Browne presented an address on "A National Museum of Agriculture; The Story of a Lost Endeavor" and showed lantern slides of agricultural museums in Europe. The presidential address by Russell H. Anderson of the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago dealt with "A National Agricultural Center as a Focal Point."¹⁷ A museum committee was authorized and started functioning late in 1939, with Carleton R. Ball as chairman and the writer as secretary.

The time seemed right to push forward for a museum of agriculture. A draft for a concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee on the establishment of a national museum of agriculture was formulated by the Solicitor, O. C. Stine, *et al.*, of the Department of Agriculture. At that point it seemed desirable for a private or unofficial organization such as the Agricultural History Society to take up the educational and promotional work. The writer interviewed some influential members of Congress

¹⁴ Copy in Agricultural History Society Archives, Museum Folder.

¹⁵ Herbert A. Kellar, Chicago, to O. C. Stine, May 17, 1922.

¹⁶ Agricultural History Society Archives, Museum Folder.

¹⁷ For these addresses, see *Agricultural History*, 13: 219-148 (July 1939).

and found general interest in, and some enthusiasm for, the agricultural museum proposal.

Carleton R. Ball began in earnest to promote the agricultural museum idea. He outlined seven suggested plans and procedures. A letter and a 3-page article were sent to over 50 agricultural papers in mid-1940. Apparently most of the papers carried the article, and many commented favorably on the need and value of an agricultural museum. The promising outlook for a museum was soon clouded by the outbreak of war in Europe. By the latter part of 1940, it became evident that the threat of our direct involvement in the war was interfering seriously with the progress of defensible projects. The museum committee then decided to suspend its activities for the duration. Let us hope that an agricultural museum will emerge in the early post-war period.

The secretary-treasurer at the annual meeting on May 24, 1939 reported 344 members. A detailed account of the membership indicated a mailing list of 338, including 21 exchanges, 6 fully paid life members, and 30 delinquents of from 1 to 8 years, leaving a balance of 281 members who were paying dues.

The two Minnesota farm boys who came to Washington and who joined the society in 1927—Everett E. Edwards and Arthur G. Peterson—were elected president and secretary-treasurer, respectively, in May 1939.

The financial position of the society was in a critical situation early in 1939. The current-year income was insufficient to pay the previous year's expenses. The creditors (the Waverly Press) expressed concern and suggested that a bankruptcy early in the year would place the loss on members rather than on the printer. The new secretary-treasurer visited the creditors at their request. He pointed out that it was incorrect to assume that all or nearly all members paid their dues at the beginning of the year. A 4-year plan for liquidating the society's debt was agreed upon.

The first essential was to increase the income of the society through a more vigorous policy in collecting dues and by increasing the membership. Second, expenditures were reduced and budgeted. Third, the accounting procedure was reorganized so as to synchronize income with expenses and to show assets and liabilities on a calendar-year basis to correspond with the membership-payment year.

The second joint session with the American Farm Economic Association was held in Phila-

delphia on December 28, 1939, thus marking the beginning of a series of continuous joint meetings between these organizations.

Three luncheon sessions were held on June 4-6, 1940 in the South Building of the Department of Agriculture, with the annual business meeting on June 6. The writer as secretary-treasurer reported an increase of 101 or 36 percent in paying members during the previous year—from 281 to 382. In addition there were 7 fully paid life members and 23 exchanges. Twenty-one whose dues were in arrears from 2 to 8 years had been dropped from the mailing list. The indebtedness had been reduced to \$1,000 at the end of 1939 compared with \$1,332 a year earlier. The secretary outlined a new proposal for the sale of life memberships for a sum in dollars equal to 100 less the age of applicant and made a motion which was adopted after considerable discussion, providing for a committee to revise the constitution and prepare a set of bylaws for the society.

Charles E. Gage spoke at the 1940 annual meeting about the long and faithful service of Claribel R. Barnett and Emma B. Hawks of the Department of Agriculture Library and their pending retirement.

The Federal tax status of payments to, and income of, the Agricultural History Society were clarified through communications with the Bureau of Internal Revenue in 1940.¹⁸

In the early 1940s additional efforts were made to establish a community of interest between general historians and agricultural historians. Earlier joint organizational effort had been chiefly with the American Historical Association and a few joint sessions with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and the American Farm Economic Association.

The Economic History Association was organized by a steering committee of which the writer was a member. The Agricultural History Society became one of the two affiliated corporate members of that association, the Business Historical Society being the other. The cordial working relationships and joint membership arrangement between the Economic History Association and the Agricultural History Society already have been of decided mutual benefit. At present, Everett E. Edwards is a vice president and the writer is a trustee of the Economic History Association.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 15:127 (April 1941).

The secretary-treasurer, who had acquired a particular interest in Florida, suggested in 1941 that agricultural history had been conspicuous by its absence in the programs of the Florida Historical Society. At the 1942 annual meeting in the historic city of St. Augustine, for the first time a session was devoted to agricultural history, at which the writer presided.

The 1941 annual meeting was enlivened by a fight against adopting committee proposals for a revised constitution and new bylaws.¹⁹ The opposition of the organized minority finally broke down, and all proposals, except the one for three vice presidents, were adopted. The provision relating to officers was remanded to the committee with instructions to continue the existing policy of having one vice president and two elected members of the executive committee, in addition to the president and secretary-treasurer. A provision to that effect was reported to and approved at the annual meeting in 1942.

The secretary-treasurer in 1941 showed some colored movies of Washington, D. C. and New Orleans. A slight increase in membership and a substantial reduction in the debt were reported. In September 1941 a memorandum was addressed to Mary G. Lacy, then assistant librarian of Department of Agriculture Library, which led to the sale of a few and the repossession of the other exchange periodicals belonging to the Agricultural History Society and previously loaned to the Library.

Few people have availed themselves of the provisions adopted in 1941 for \$1.50 student memberships and life memberships based on life expectancy. The joint membership rate of \$2.50 with the Economic History Association, adopted in 1942, has brought quite a few new members.

Article IV of the bylaws provides that "All funds hereafter received as lump-sum payments for life membership, and contributions to the permanent fund of the Society, shall be maintained as a capital fund. . . ." A capital fund was started with the proceeds from the sale of a life membership in 1942.

The membership declined a little, especially in foreign countries, during the first year after the United States entered World War II. An exchange of advertising was arranged with four professional journals in 1941 and a fifth one early

in 1943. The bylaws were amended in 1942 to give the executive committee discretionary authority to increase dues to \$4.00 for individual and/or institutional members. Joint sessions had been arranged for December 1942 meetings with the American Historical Association and the American Farm Economic Association, but the scheduled meetings were cancelled at the request of the Office of Defense Transportation.

The society carried on its activities and made considerable progress during the year ended April 30, 1943 despite many wartime changes.²⁰

The long-standing debt of the society was paid in full by the end of 1942 in line with the 4-year plan adopted in 1939, and the fiscal year was shifted to correspond with the calendar year. Although quite a few members had entered the military services and dropped out of the society, the total membership in April 1943 was a little larger than a year earlier.

The members, at the 1943 annual meeting, authorized the executive committee to select and adopt an official seal for the society and to develop some special program for the twenty-fifth anniversary of the society in 1944. A new standing committee on membership was established with the vice president as chairman. The new president was authorized to arrange such cooperation with the proposed National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee as seemed appropriate for the society.

The Agricultural History Society was represented on the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee by Theodore R. Schellenberg. This committee held a meeting on February 2, 1944 and discussed various ways of recognizing and publicizing Thomas Jefferson's contributions to agriculture. A pilgrimage to Monticello was made on April 13, 1944, the 201st anniversary of Jefferson's birth. About 65 people attended from Washington, D. C.; a considerable number were members of the Agricultural History Society.

The membership of 413, plus 25 exchanges, and the net assets of the society were at a new high in 1944. The increase in net assets during the last two years is due in part to the war, or rather the War Production Board. In 1942 two of the

²⁰ See the secretary-treasurer's letter of Apr. 10, 1943, to the members and his letter of Apr. 16, 1943 to Charles J. Brand; also the report of the editor dated Apr. 27, 1943.

¹⁹ See the 18-page transcript of the proceedings in the Agricultural History Society Archives.

numbers of *Agricultural History* were limited to half size in order to complete the liquidation of the printing debt. In March 1943 the War Production Board ordered a limitation on the use of paper, based on the amount used in 1942. Thus the journal's paper allotment was frozen at the relatively low level of the self-imposed quota for 1942, despite an appeal by the editor.

At the twenty-fifth anniversary meeting, an official seal for the society was adopted for use on its letterhead and journal. A scholarly report on "Objectives for the Agricultural History Society during its Second Twenty-Five Years" was presented by Everett E. Edwards. Two of the founders, Lyman Carrier, the first secretary-treasurer, and O. C. Stine, a member of the first executive committee, were present and spoke briefly about the history of the society.

What, you may ask, is the summation of this piecemeal narrative?

The principal objectives of the society have been "to stimulate interest in, to promote the study of, and to facilitate research and publication on the history of agriculture."

Although considerably more could have been done the society has accomplished a good deal in the way of stimulating interest and in facilitating publication. However, still lacking are effective aids in such things as sponsoring the teaching of agricultural history, establishing agricultural mu-

seums, and getting agricultural scientists to prepare histories of their particular fields of endeavor.

On the credit side, we have weathered the financial pitfalls of adolescence and have become an established and respected institution. As a going concern with abundant good will we should enjoy a moderate growth and proceed in the next twenty-five years to accomplish many of the objectives so ably presented last year by Everett E. Edwards.

The society has served as a focus for a rather wide variety of interests in agricultural history. To a substantial majority of the members agricultural history is but an avocation, not the chief professional interest. The society has also provided a common meeting ground from which have come many benefits of professional friendships.

Inasmuch as my participation in the Agricultural History Society henceforth will be in the nature of an anticlimax, I wish to conclude with a personal comment. I shall always think of the society as a part of my life. The salesmanship in acquiring new members, developing the life-membership formula based on life expectancy, revising the constitution and bylaws, the financial management, and developing the seal of the society—my participation in these and other matters will be a continuing source of pleasant reminiscences. Last but not least I shall treasure the many fine friends that I have made through the Agricultural History Society.

APPENDIX 1: CHARTER MEMBERS

This list is based on the signatures appended to the constitution adopted on Feb. 14, 1919 and on subscription record cards. The asterisks indicate the persons who did not sign the constitution but paid dues by Mar. 15, 1919. W. R. Beattie, D. A. Brodie, and Leon M. Estabrook signed the constitution, but no record card has been found for them.

R. M. Adams
L. C. Aicher
F. J. Alway*
Frank Andrews
J. H. Arnold
A. C. Baker
O. E. Baker
C. R. Ball
Claribel R. Barnett
J. H. Barnhart*
S. C. Bassett*
W. H. Beal
W. R. Beattie
P. W. Bidwell*
G. A. Billings
Katherine S. Bort
J. C. Brinsmade, Jr.

D. A. Brodie
Edmund C. Burnett
O. F. Burger*
Charles G. Carpenter
Lyman Carrier
C. E. Chambliss*
Agnes Chase
F. H. Chittenden
J. A. Clark
C. P. Close
G. N. Collins*
Louis G. Connor
O. F. Cook
M. R. Cooper
L. C. Corbett
Frederick V. Coville
M. A. Crosby

A. J. Dadisman*
Lyster H. Dewey
J. A. Drake
Perry Elliott
Leon M. Estabrook
J. I. Falconer
F. D. Farrell*
Cora L. Feldkamp
Robert E. Getty
C. L. Goodrich*
H. P. Gould
David Griffith (?)
P. H. Hale*
F. S. Harris*
Fairfax Harrison*
C. P. Hartley
Edna G. Hartman

E. S. Haskell
H. W. Hawthorne*
Bertha Henderson*
C. L. Holmes
George K. Holmes
Horace E. Horton*
L. O. Howard
S. M. Huddleson
Byron Hunter
J. F. Jameson
R. W. Kelsey
Leonard W. Kephart
William M. King
Mary G. Lacy
G. N. Lauman*
H. Barrett Learned
C. W. Larson
George A. Maloney
John H. Martin
S. C. Mason
Roland McKee
H. A. Miller
J. R. Mohler
E. G. Montgomery*
Leroy Moomaw
A. J. Morrison*

W. J. Morse
Nat C. Murray
Magdalene R. Newman
J. B. S. Norton*
R. A. Oakley
Joseph Passonneau*
C. V. Piper
R. R. Price*
G. W. Putnam*
A. L. Quaintance
J. O. Rankin*
B. H. Rawl
P. L. Ricker
B. E. Rothgeb
J. C. Rundles
W. E. Safford
J. A. Saul*
D. W. Sawtelle*
L. B. Scott
C. L. Shear
D. N. Shoemaker
Oliver Smith
R. R. Spafford
A. T. Speare
T. R. Stanton

Neil E. Stevens
C. L. Stewart*
O. C. Stine
W. W. Stockberger*
Helen M. Strong
W. Stuart
William A. Taylor
Lila Thompson*
C. O. Townsend
Will W. Tracy
William J. Trimble
A. C. True
Rodney H. True
H. N. Vinall
M. B. Waite
W. R. Walton
C. W. Warburton*
Marjorie F. Warner
G. F. White
Edward Whitney*
E. V. Wilcox
H. J. Wilder*
M. L. Wilson*
A. F. Woods*
George F. Zook

APPENDIX 2: CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS, 1919-1944

Presidents

Rodney H. True, 1919-21
Lyman Carrier, 1921-22
Herbert A. Kellar, 1922-24
O. C. Stine, 1924-25
E. E. Dale, 1925-27
Rodney H. True, 1927-28
Solon J. Buck, 1928-29
E. Merton Coulter, 1929-30

Avery Craven, 1930-31
Joseph Schafer, 1931-32
Ulrich B. Phillips, 1932-33
Louis B. Schmidt, 1933-34
Edwin F. Gay, 1934-35
Clifford V. Gregory, 1935-36
Henry C. Taylor, 1936-37
M. L. Wilson, 1937-38

Russell H. Anderson, 1938-39
Everett E. Edwards, 1939-40
Wendell H. Stephenson, 1940-41
Harry J. Carman, 1941-42
Carl R. Woodward, 1942-43
James C. Malin, 1943-44
Arthur G. Peterson, 1944-45

Vice Presidents

William J. Trimble, 1919-21
Herbert A. Kellar, 1921-22
O. C. Stine, 1922-24
E. E. Dale, 1924-25
Nils A. Olsen, 1925-27
L. C. Gray, 1927-28
F. D. Farrell, 1928-29
Rodney H. True, 1929-30

W. Freeman Galpin, 1930-32
L. C. Gray, 1932-33
Ralph H. Gabriel, 1933-34
Clifford V. Gregory, 1934-35
G. N. Lauman, 1935-36
Mary G. Lacy, 1936-37
Frederick Merk, 1937-38

Carl R. Woodward, 1938-39
Harold E. Briggs, 1939-40
Harry J. Carman, 1940-41
John D. Hicks, 1941-42
James C. Malin, 1942-43
Theodore R. Schellenberg, 1943-44
Joseph C. Robert, 1944-45

Secretary-Treasurers

Lyman Carrier, 1919-21
Nils A. Olsen, 1921-24

Herbert A. Kellar, 1924-27
O. C. Stine, 1927-39

Arthur G. Peterson, 1939-44
Charles A. Burmeister, 1944-

THE ORIGIN OF THE LAND SPECULATOR AS A FRONTIER TYPE

RAY ALLEN BILLINGTON

Department of History, Northwestern University

When Frederick Jackson Turner pictured the westward movement of the American people in terms of a succession of pioneer types—traders, cattlemen, primitive farmers, and equipped farmers—all moving in orderly procession across the face of the continent, he omitted one individual who played a major rôle in the march of civilization, namely the land speculator.¹ Only during the past dozen years have historians become fully aware of the importance of Professor Turner's omission.² Their industrious spading over a previously uncultivated field has indicated both the extent of land-jobbing activity in the history of the frontier and the effect of that activity on the developing social patterns of the United States,³ and yet much remains to be done. The

rich returns waiting future investigators can be shown by examining the part played by speculators in the early colonial period. This examination will indicate both the many aspects of the subject needing further investigation and the importance of the land jobber in an era when he has generally been believed to have had little influence.

¹ The reading incident to the preparation of this article was made possible by a Guggenheim Memorial Foundation Fellowship during 1943-44. The article, in somewhat extended form, was delivered as the Schouler Lecture at Johns Hopkins University in April 1944.

² Frederick J. Turner, *The Frontier in American History*, 12 (New York, 1920).

³ A number of scholars have exploited the rich materials on land speculation in the national period. Thomas P. Abernethy, *Western Lands and the American Revolution* (New York, 1937), is an excellent treatment of the speculator in the formative years of the Republic, while Merrill Jensen has shown the influence of speculation on the early national government in several brilliant studies: "The Cession of the Old Northwest," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 23:27-48 (1936); "The Creation of the National Domain, 1781-1784," *ibid.*, 26:323-342 (1939); and *The Articles of Confederation* (Madison, Wis., 1940). Speculative activity in the southwest is the theme of Arthur P. Whitaker in "The Muscle Shoals Speculation, 1783-1789," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 13:365-386 (1926), and "The South Carolina Yazoo Company," *ibid.*, 16:383-394 (1929). Paul D. Evans has studied the large companies that operated in New York at the turn of the nineteenth century in "The Pulteney Purchase," *New York State Historical Association, Quarterly Journal*, 3:83-104 (1922), and *The Holland Land Company* (Buffalo, N. Y., 1924). Helen I. Cowan, *Charles Williamson, Genesee Promoter* (Roch-

ester, N. Y., 1941), is another study of the same area. A number of Middle Atlantic States companies operating at the same time, such as the Pennsylvania Population Company, still wait investigation. Speculative activity in the Ohio Valley just after the Revolution is traced in: Archer B. Hulbert, *The Records of the Original Proceedings of the Ohio Company* (Marietta, Ohio, 1917), "The Methods and Operations of the Scioto Group of Speculators," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 1:502-515, 2:56-73 (1915), and "Andrew Craigie and the Scioto Associates," *American Antiquarian Society, Proceedings* (n.s.), 23:222-236 (1913); Joseph S. Davis, *Essays in the Earlier History of American Corporations* (Cambridge, Mass., 1917); and Helen M. Carpenter, "The Origin and Location of the Firelands of the Western Reserve," *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly*, 44:163-203 (1935). The role of the railroads as land jobbers was first explored by James B. Hedges in "The Colonization Work of the Northern Pacific Railroad," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 13:311-342 (1926); "Promotion of Immigration to the Pacific Northwest by the Railroads," *ibid.*, 15:183-203 (1928); *Henry Villard and the Railways of the Northwest* (New Haven, 1930); and *Building the Canadian West* (New York, 1939). His scholarship has inspired two similar studies: Paul Wallace Gates, *The Illinois Central Railroad and Its Colonization Work* (Cambridge, Mass., 1934), and Richard C. Overton, *Burlington West* (Cambridge, Mass., 1941). Gates has roamed far over the field with such stimulating studies as: "The Homestead Law in an Incongruous Land System," *American Historical Review*, 41:652-681 (1936); "Southern Investments in Northern Lands before the Civil War," *Journal of Southern History*, 5:155-185 (1939); "Land Policy and Tenancy in the Prairie Counties of Indiana," *Indiana Magazine of History*, 35:1-26 (1939); and "The Role of the Land Speculator in Western Development," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 66:314-333 (1942).

Students of land speculation have made clear the distinction between the various types of speculators who moved westward with the pioneers.⁴ Some were ordinary farmers who, on reaching the frontier, engrossed far more land than they could use in hope of subsequent profitable resale to later arrivals. Others were businessmen and bankers who lived in the tiny western hamlets and supplemented their income by bartering lands as well as furs, whiskey, and merchandise. Still others were eastern merchants or planters who, as individuals, used their wealth or political influence to acquire large estates in the wilderness. More spectacular were the capitalists who organized into companies, large and small, and used their combined resources to secure vast frontier tracts which were then advertised widely and sold. All of these men, from the shabby farmer staking out his "tomahawk claim" to a hundred acres more than he could use in the Yadkin Valley to the wealthy Philadelphia merchant plotting to secure a royal grant for a new interior colony, were speculators.

The frontiersmen, however, made a clear distinction between two types of land jobbers, the amateurs and the professionals. In their eyes the amateurs—small farmers who simply purchased more land than they could use—were not objectionable, for the frontier never realized that the pioneer who held back land from settlement in this way separated himself from his neighbors, delayed the coming of schools and internal improvements, and hindered the development of social institutions that would have made life easier. Instead the westerners concentrated their attacks on the professional speculators, most of whom were absentee owners who, it was claimed, wrung an unearned profit from hard-working farmers while contributing nothing themselves to the advance of civilization. To understand the rôle of the speculator in colonial America it is necessary to follow this distinction and consider the amateurs and professionals separately.

The importance of the former group, even in colonial times, is today clearly recognized. The European peasants who swarmed across the Atlantic Ocean in the seventeenth century were land hungry. Most of them had never owned farms in the Old World, and the presence of so

much land in the New, to be had cheaply, was more of a temptation than they could resist. But little is known of the effect of their speculations on the settlement process. How much land, in excess of the 40 or 50 acres that a pioneer farmer could clear and care for, did they take out? Did their purchases vary in periods of prosperity and depression, with a tendency to engross more in good times when prospects of resale were bright? Did this variance affect the speed with which the frontier advanced? These questions offer a tempting—if somewhat tedious—field of study for the frontier historian. Most of the answers can be found only by a minute study of county records, with their detailed listing of individual purchases and resales, which must be carried on by many scholars. Fortunately the careful listing of these important sources by the Historical Records Survey of the Works Progress Administration has made the task easier. It is to be hoped that college instructors throughout the country will awaken to the importance of this work (and to the happy prospect of as many masters' thesis subjects as there are counties in the United States) and direct their students into the many detailed studies needed to throw light on this vital subject.

An example of the possibilities awaiting investigators is provided by a recent survey of the amazingly complete county records of Virginia's Eastern Shore.⁵ This study challenges the long-accepted belief that small-farm agriculture persisted in the tobacco colonies through the seventeenth century by proving that the average Accomac grants in the 1650s contained more than 900 acres.⁶ By 1700, however, the fractional division of these great estates had reduced them to the size generally recognized by historians as typical of the whole century. These statistics in themselves prove little, for the area under study is too small to illustrate any general trend, but a similar study of the records for the rest of Virginia and Maryland would probably dovetail them into an important pattern illustrative of landownership in the Southern Tidewater. This might show that the large mid-century holdings were accumulated amidst the prosperity of

⁴ Paul Wallace Gates, "The Disposal of the Public Domain in Illinois, 1848-1856," *Journal of Economic and Business History*, 3:216-240 (1931).

⁵ Susie M. Ames, *Studies of the Virginia Eastern Shore in the Seventeenth Century* (Richmond, Va., 1940).

⁶ Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *The Planters of Colonial Virginia* (Princeton, N. J., 1922).

that period primarily with the hope of resale. It might demonstrate that a rapid breaking up of the great estates accompanied the depression of the 1670s and 1680s, and that while these were being divided others were rising along the frontier. It might offer a sound reason for the conservatism of the Eastern Shore during Bacon's Rebellion by showing that planters there could sell off their excess holdings and thus escape the poverty that shaped discontent in the rest of the colony. Certainly such a study would give us a clearer picture of life in the tobacco provinces than we have today.

Moreover careful surveys of the records of these Southern Colonies would probably reveal a typical speculative pattern in landholding: a succession of zones distinguished by the varying size of farms—in the far west a band of small clearings tilled by squatters or restless pioneers, then a belt of large estates owned by reasonably well-equipped farmers who planted corn and tobacco on a few of their broad acres and held the rest for resale, then a zone of slightly smaller holdings in a higher stage of civilization where an initial division was taking place, and finally a settled region of small farms that could be cared for by the owners and indentured servants then available. The presence of this pattern was suggested by two laws passed by the Virginia burgesses in 1705, one limiting the size of patents and the other applying the law of entail. The former was an obvious attempt to check the growth of speculative holdings in the west, while the latter sought to end the rapid division of eastern estates then going on. Apparently the frontier process had reached a stage, even on the narrow strip of the Virginia Tidewater, that was causing alarm among the embryo planters of the seaboard who controlled the legislature.

Finally, a detailed examination of landholdings in the Southern Colonies might shed light on the relationship between speculation and the speed with which the frontier advanced. Speculative buying undoubtedly was greater in periods of prosperity than in times of depression, for purchases were encouraged both by the plentiful capital seeking investment and by the prospect of speedy resale. The one statistical study of this problem, dealing with a later period, shows an exact correlation between commodity prices and

land sales.⁷ This heavy buying would, in turn, hurry the westward movement of the population, for the large holdings accumulated along the frontier would drive home seekers still farther inland in search of cheap sites. In periods of depression, on the other hand, newcomers to the west would no longer seek lands beyond the fringe of settlement, for they could buy up the excess holdings that the speculators could no longer afford to keep. In other words, a careful study of the relationship between land sales and the westward advance of pioneers would probably disclose two things: that the size of farms in the west varied with the region's prosperity, swelling in good times and shrinking in periods of depression, and that those extensions and contractions were primarily responsible for each westward surge of the frontier, rather than Indian wars, immigration, internal improvements, or distressing conditions at home. Thus the effect of speculation was to accentuate the cyclical nature of the westward movement, speeding pioneers toward the interior when times were good, and checking their advance in periods of depression.

These results, and the spirit of speculation responsible for them, are easily understandable in the Southern Colonies, for the encouragement to private initiative given by crown and proprietors created an atmosphere conducive to this form of activity. That the same speculative fever could develop in seventeenth-century New England was a better indication of the effect of the New World environment on transplanted Englishmen. Not even the staunch Puritans who built their homes along that stern and rock-bound coast could restrain the urge to accumulate lands, and within half a century after they planted their settlements their carefully-planned Wilderness Zion was threatened by forces that stemmed directly from speculation.

The founding fathers certainly envisaged no such development. Their ambition—a commonwealth of orthodox believers devoted to propagating the revealed word—led them to abandon the system of headrights and grants authorized by the royal charters and to vest in the legislatures sole authority over the "sitting down of men," with the understanding that lands were to be given free to groups of unquestioned faith. They

⁷ Arthur H. Cole, "Cyclical and Sectional Variation in the Sale of Public Lands, 1816-60," *Review of Economic Statistics*, 9:41-53 (1927).

viewed the public domain, not as a source of profit, but as a medium to be employed in spreading the true religion westward. Hence they authorized only two types of grants—to individuals and to groups—both to be made without charge to men of proper social and religious status.

The awards made to individuals deserve further study, for they apparently were sufficiently common to indicate that some of the leading colonists were not above engrossing land for profit purposes. Between 1630 and 1675 the Massachusetts General Court alone granted 130,000 acres to influential persons. About half of this went to favored officials; during these years, thirty-two assistants and governors voted themselves nearly 60,000 acres in plots that varied from 1,000 to 9,000 acres each. The size of these holdings, in a region where the usual farms were only from 10 to 100 acres in extent, seems to indicate a speculative purpose. This was made even clearer by the fact that few awards were made to ministers—only eleven grants totalling 6,000 acres in the forty-five years—despite the repeated assertion that all allotments were made to reward meritorious service.⁸ Although these individual grants were dwarfed by the more common group grants, they were sufficiently numerous to indicate that even the earliest Puritans were not completely disinterested in speculation or profits.

Even more important was the gradual development of a speculative spirit in the administration of town lands. Town sites in colonial New England were ordinarily awarded to any group of acceptable believers with the understanding that land was to be divided without charge among later comers until the village was settled. At first these proprietors lived up to their obligations cheerfully, but as time passed and thickening settlement brought home the value of their holdings, they showed an increasing tendency to retain control of the undivided lands and refuse grants even to men of proper religious views. Thus there grew up in each New England town two distinct classes, one consisting of the original proprietors and their heirs, the other of new arrivals who were landless or whose holdings were restricted to the farm plots originally granted them. The landless and the small holders wanted

to divide the remaining town lands; the proprietors, sensing possible future profits, were reluctant to meet this demand. Thus were planted the seeds of conflict that racked nearly every village.

This conflict usually began in the town meetings where the newcomers, or freemen, had an equal political voice with the proprietors. It went on until the freemen, who were steadily increasing in numbers while the proprietary group remained stable, gained ascendancy. At this point their clamor grew so great that arbitrators were often called in from neighboring towns, or the case carried into the law courts in an attempt to force a further division of the town property. The proprietors, when faced with this threat, attempted to protect their holdings by forming a separate corporation, distinct from the town meeting, with the sole purpose of guarding their holdings from popular attack. This step was legalized by Plymouth and Rhode Island in 1682, Massachusetts in 1698, New Hampshire in 1718, and Connecticut in 1723. Thus organized, the proprietary corporations were strong enough to triumph over their enemies, for the courts had no choice but to recognize the sole right of the original grantees to the town lands. Although these corporations made few attempts to sell the undivided fields for cash in the seventeenth century, their willingness to fight in courts and town meetings against further divisions certainly indicated the development of a speculative spirit, at least in embryo form.⁹

These conflicts between proprietors and freemen had much to do with the rapid expansion of the New England frontier, for each defeat left the nonproprietary dissatisfied and convinced that only by moving farther inland could they secure the larger fields that they wanted. Probably few of them went west as proprietors themselves; the aristocratic governors of New England would hesitate to assign the task of laying out new towns to men of such small property. Instead most of them moved as individuals to frontier communities whose proprietors had not yet caught the speculative fever and would be more generous in their allotments. Thus land grabbing, even in this rudimentary form, proved one of the powerful

⁸ Statistics compiled by S. H. Brockunier from N. B. Shurtleff, ed., *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England*, vols. 1-4 (Boston, 1853-54).

⁹ Roy H. Akagi, *The Town Proprietors of the New England Colonies* (Philadelphia, 1924), and Florence M. Woodard, *The Town Proprietors in Vermont* (New York, 1936), contain the best account of the New England land system.

expelling forces sending New Englanders westward during the seventeenth century.

These speculators, in New England and the tobacco colonies, typified the amateurs who through the history of the frontier engrossed more land than they needed. Present among them, even in the early days of settlement, were other jobbers who made the buying and selling of land a major activity. These professional operators usually lived in seaboard cities or on the richer Tidewater plantations; some of them maintained agents to acquire and supervise their western holdings or organized companies to pool their resources for greater purchases. Their activities in the late eighteenth century have recently been recognized by historians, but the history of professional land speculation in the seventeenth century is still a virtually unexplored field.

The little research that has been done discloses the possibilities of the subject, for apparently professional speculators were operating from New England to the Carolinas within a few years after the first settlements. They were certainly at work in Maryland and Virginia well before the end of the seventeenth century, encouraged by the peculiar conditions that shaped the agricultural development of those tobacco colonies. Land suitable to the production of this staple was comparatively rare; only the rich river bottoms offered both the deep soil and the adequate water transportation necessary. Land jobbers who could secure these choice sites in advance of settlement were assured handsome profits, for new settlers were crowding in from Europe and old settlers were moving westward as soil exhaustion drove them from their barren fields. Here were conditions likely to breed speculative activity.

The speculators' first problem was to find some means of acquiring land, for none was sold in early Maryland or Virginia. Their ingenious methods demonstrate their eagerness. They soon found that ship captains and contractors who received headrights for transporting indentured servants to America were ready to sell for a small sum, and by the middle of the seventeenth century the jobbers were buying up these warrants, pushing up the river valleys, and patenting the richest fields. When this source proved inadequate, they turned to the indentured servants themselves. These laborers, after completing their seven years of bonded service, were given from 50 to 100 acres of land on which to make their homes. The speculators found that most of these freed workers

did not have the capital needed to exploit their new possessions and were willing to sell. Frequently a land jobber would herd as many as fifty recently released servants into the office of the secretary of the province, supervise them while they secured their land patents, and purchase all the warrants then and there. These were then used, as were the headrights secured from ship masters and contractors, to engross choice river sites.¹⁰

These activities undoubtedly affected the ebb and flow of the advancing tide of settlement. By usurping the best lands and holding them for higher prices—prices in Maryland rose 130 percent between 1660 and the end of the century¹¹—the speculators hurried the peopling of the less desirable regions that were either distant from rivers or beyond the protection of the older settlements. Most of the indentured servants who had sold their grants probably sought homes there, using the money obtained from land jobbers to buy needed materials, and either squatting on the land or purchasing the inferior sites cheaply. Thus here, as elsewhere, the speculators helped speed the westward advance by withholding from cultivation great tracts east of the frontier line.

Professional speculators also began to operate in New England during the seventeenth century. Most of them were wealthy seaboard businessmen who had accumulated modest fortunes through commercial or shipping ventures. With their money chests overflowing, they naturally cast about for profitable investments. These were difficult to find. Land offered the only outlet, yet speculative accumulations within their own colonies were impossible, for the legislatures would make no grants except to groups for religious purposes. Hence they were forced to turn to three other regions in their search for wealth: to Maine, the neighboring provinces of New York and New Jersey, and to Rhode Island.

Little is known of the activity of these New England businessmen in the first two sections. They certainly invested widely in Maine lands, for

¹⁰ Abbot Emerson Smith, "The Indentured Servant and Land Speculation in Seventeenth Century Maryland," *American Historical Review*, 40:467-472 (1935); V. J. Wyckoff, "The Sizes of Plantations in Seventeenth-Century Maryland," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 32:331-339 (1937).

¹¹ V. J. Wyckoff, "Land Prices in Seventeenth-Century Maryland," *American Economic Review*, 28:82-88 (1938).

that northern province was only thinly settled and promised rich returns. The companies that sprang up to exploit its resources deserve study. Similarly Boston and New Haven capitalists, organized into trading and speculating corporations, played some part in the conquest of New Jersey. One important company, the Delaware Company, engaged in a three-cornered contest with Netherlands and Sweden for control of the Delaware Valley,¹² and others probably encouraged the settlement of New Englanders in New Jersey and on the eastern end of Long Island. Some such incentive must have been responsible for the large Puritan migration to those remote parts. Other organizations of speculators intruded into the Dutch domain along the Hudson Valley and helped precipitate the conflict that added New York to the British Empire. The attempt of a New Haven concern to establish a trading colony near Albany in 1645 so enraged bluff old Peter Stuyvesant that he visited Hartford to protest, and a Boston company that tried to plant itself near Poughkeepsie in 1659 might have plunged the two nations into a premature war had not unsettled conditions attending the Restoration ended the enterprise.¹³ Probably a further study of these activities would lead to a rewriting of much of the diplomatic history of colonial America.

Something more is known of New England speculation in the third field open to Boston entrepreneurs—Rhode Island—yet this too deserves investigation. This tiny colony, scorned by the Puritans for its tolerance and liberalism, was considered a legitimate field for exploitation, for Massachusetts and Connecticut were willing to back their businessmen in any blow at Roger Williams' despised followers. At least three speculating companies operated there, all concentrating their activities in the fertile region west of Narragansett Bay occupied by an Indian tribe of the same name. Two of these, the Pettaquamscutt Company and the Misquamicutt Company, evidently were fairly unimportant, but

a third, the Atherton Company, influenced New England affairs for some time. An examination of its brief career will illustrate the importance of these land-jobbing schemes in the life of the day.¹⁴

The Atherton Company was formed at Boston in 1659 with most of the leading capitalists of that city, Taunton, and Portsmouth included in its ranks, as well as Governor John Winthrop, Jr., of Connecticut. In the same year two large tracts adjoining Narragansett Bay were purchased from the Indians in open defiance of a Rhode Island law of 1658 forbidding such sales. A year later the company saw a chance to extend its operations when the colonial authorities imposed an impossible fine on the Narragansett tribe for one of its periodic outbursts. The company's leaders immediately offered to assume the debt in return for a mortgage on all the Narragansett lands, to be repaid within six months. Probably the sachems who made this agreement did not understand its terms; certainly they were unable to meet their payments, and in 1662 the speculators took over the whole Narragansett country. For the next dozen years their efforts to make good their claim over the protests of Rhode Island and the crown seriously affected colonial affairs.

Their first step was to solicit the aid of one of the company's members, Governor Winthrop of Connecticut, whose solution was to seek a new charter for his colony that would extend Connecticut's boundaries as far east as Narragansett Bay, thus bringing the whole disputed region under his jurisdiction. These efforts were temporarily crowned with success in May 1662, when a charter with the desired boundaries was issued by the king, but Rhode Island's outcry was so vigorous that the royal officials consented to take the whole question under advisement. The company, desperately afraid of losing its advantage, enlisted as a new member one John Scott, a court hanger-on well skilled in the use of bribes, who immediately sent in a bill for "a parcel of curiosities to ye value of 60: to gratifye persons that are powerfull." These precautions were in vain, for a committee of arbitration eventually decided that the Rhode Island boundary extended west to the Pawcatuct River. Connecticut refused to accept this finding, and the dispute dragged on for a number of years. Its details can

¹² For a brief account of these activities, see Amandus Johnson, *The Swedish Settlements on the Delaware* (New York, 1911).

¹³ Arthur H. Buffinton, "New England and the Western Fur Trade, 1629-1675," *Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Publications*, 18:160-192 (Boston, 1917), emphasizes the trading aspect of these ventures, which were also speculative.

¹⁴ For a factual account of these companies, see Irving B. Richman, *Rhode Island* (New York, 1902).

never be understood until the influence of the Atherton Company has been properly appraised.

Before this conflict was settled, another opportunity for the company presented itself in the form of King Philip's War. At first this promised to be only a minor rebellion, for King Philip was the chieftain of only one small tribe, the Wampanoags, whose few villages in the marshes east of Narragansett Bay could offer only feeble resistance. The strong force from Massachusetts and Plymouth that set out in pursuit of the marauders in the spring of 1675 easily drove them into a large swamp. Victory seemed certain, for the colonists needed only to wait until their savage foes were starved into surrender, when the Massachusetts officials took the one step needed to transform this war from a minor outbreak to a major conflict. They ordered the Massachusetts soldiers to march southward into the Narragansett country, supposedly to wring a treaty of peace from that already-peaceful tribe. The results were disastrous. With most of the guards removed, Philip and his warriors escaped into western Massachusetts, persuaded the Indians there to take to the warpath and swept against the interior settlements in a series of bloody raids that lasted for two years. At the same time the Narragansett Indians, who had shown every intention of remaining peaceful, were driven into the war by the invasion of their territory.

This foolish blunder on the part of the Massachusetts authorities could have been prompted by only two things. One was a desire to strike a blow at unpopular Rhode Island through an Indian tribe that was closely bound to Williams' colony by ties of trade and friendship. The other was the ambition of the Atherton Company. If the Narragansett Indians could be goaded into war and then decisively defeated, their lands, which were claimed by the company, would be open to settlement. The large company representation among the Massachusetts officials who ordered this ill-fated expedition seems to indicate that pressure from these speculators was at least partially responsible for a war that cost hundreds of lives and thousands of dollars.

Important as the speculators' rôle was in shaping the course of seventeenth-century history, the land-jobbing fever did not reach its height in America until well into the next century. This was a day of bold commercial enterprise, of a wild scramble after wealth, of the pyramiding of giddy paper fortunes, on both sides of the Atlantic. In

the colonies this activity was confined largely to speculation in land, for other forms of investment were few, and both money and grandiose dreams were plentiful. Historians have recognized the importance of these speculators, but their scattered studies leave many gaps to be filled.

Thus far little attention has been paid to the first half of the eighteenth century. Speculation in the South during those years evidently took the form of vast individual grants to favored Tidewater planters by the legislatures of Virginia and the Carolinas. Hundreds of tracts in the Piedmont and the Great Valley, ranging from 10,000 to 50,000 acres, were parceled out free of charge or for a small fee, despite all the efforts of the crown and royal officials to check the practice. Thus Governor Alexander Spotswood of Virginia, after waging a brief but gallant battle against speculation, succumbed to the mania and began engrossing land himself, while a royal agent sent to North Carolina with specific instructions to end the granting of large estates proved such an easy victim that he built up nearly a million acres of speculative holdings.¹⁵ The means by which the planters accumulated land, their methods of advertising and selling their estates, and the effect of their operations on the Scotch-Irish and German immigrants then crowding down the Great Valley, remain untold chapters in the history of the frontier. So also does the story of the speculation in New York and Pennsylvania that drove these new arrivals southward in search of cheap lands.¹⁶

The speculative fever also swept across New England in the first half of the eighteenth century, with devastating effects on the land systems of the colonies there. Wealthy business leaders of Boston and Salem caught the infection first and began buying up plots from proprietors of new towns or from old towns where undivided lands were still available. For a time the legislatures resisted this pressure and continued to grant land only to orthodox religious groups, but Connecticut succumbed in 1715, Massachusetts in 1727, and

¹⁵ These activities are mentioned in Herbert L. Osgood, *The American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century*, 4:116-135 (New York, 1924); Charles L. Raper, *North Carolina*, 101-124 (New York, 1904); and Leonidas Dodson, *Alexander Spotswood* (Philadelphia, 1932).

¹⁶ The importance of such a study for New York is indicated by the materials in Ruth L. Higgins, *Expansion in New York, with Especial Reference to the Eighteenth Century* (Columbus, Ohio, 1931).

the others soon afterward. From that time on they openly sold their town sites to the highest bidders, with little thought of contiguous settlement by nonprofit-seeking true believers. This desire for profits changed the whole course of New England's westward advance by breaking down the emphasis on groups and preparing the descendants of the Puritans to move into the trans-Appalachian area as individuals. A study of the transition of this land system would not only shed light on the settlement of that region's upland country but would make clearer our understanding of the whole frontier process.¹⁷

Thorough investigations of these many activities, both amateur and professional, together with special studies to fill the gaps between the excellent monographs that have recently described the large-scale speculations of the late eighteenth century,¹⁸ would not only illuminate the history of the colonial period but would help assign the land jobber to his proper place in the frontier process. Was he a worthless wretch who wrung unearned profits from helpless pioneers and spread suffering and poverty in his wake? Or did he contribute his mite to the settling of the American continent?

Such a survey would probably show that the amateur speculators and the small professionals did more harm than good. Their purchases forced a more rapid dispersal of population than was healthy for institutional development, delayed the coming of schools and churches, and slowed the

transformation from wilderness to civilization.¹⁹ Their frantic efforts to improve their properties corrupted politics and subordinated national to local interests in locating internal improvements, county seats, and colleges. Even the larger speculating companies, backed by rich reservoirs of European capital, apparently contributed little, for their lavish expenditures only deprived the frontiersmen of the quick profits normally awaiting the first pioneers, and their faulty advertising aroused false hopes among eastern innocents. Why, in the face of this imposing list of wrongs, did public opinion allow the land jobbers to endure?

The speculators probably survived popular wrath for two centuries only because they played a legitimate but unpopular rôle as middlemen between the original governmental owners of land and the ultimate purchasers. The average pioneer wanted two things when he moved west: good land adjacent to adequate transportation facilities, and credit extended over enough years to permit payment from the proceeds of his farm. The speculators could provide both and had a real reason for existence as long as they could do so.

The speculators had the facilities to spy out the best land. Most of the large companies, and many of the individual jobbers, maintained regular agents along the frontier, usually employing traders or hunters for this task. These experienced woodsmen sought out the rich soil regions, or the fertile areas near navigable rivers, and preempted them for their employers. A pioneer farmer who purchased from a speculating company could be reasonably sure that his land was good and that he could count on the best transportation available in that area, while one who located his own lands might be misled by surface features to select a farm with poor soil and inadequate market outlets.

More important was the fact that the great companies, and even the larger individual speculators, could provide credit. Their resources allowed them to pay cash for large blocks of western land, which could then be parceled out among small purchasers on easy terms. Usually a frontiersman was allowed so much time to complete his payments that he was able, with any luck, to earn enough from his farm to buy the property and lay aside a comfortable nest egg as

¹⁷ For the best account of the transition, see Woodard, *The Town Proprietors in Vermont*.

¹⁸ Clarence W. Alvord, *The Mississippi Valley in British Politics* (Cleveland, 1917) was the pioneering work in this field. Recent important studies include: John R. Alden, *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1944); Clarence W. Alvord, ed., *The Illinois-Wabash Land Company Manuscript* (Chicago, 1915); Kenneth P. Bailey, *The Ohio Company of Virginia* (Glendale, Calif., 1939); Ray A. Billington, "The Fort Stanwix Treaty of 1768," *New York History*, 25:182-194 (1944); Julian P. Boyd, ed., *The Susquehanna Company Papers* (Wilkes-Barre, Pa., 1930-31); Archibald Henderson, "Dr. Thomas Walker and the Loyal Company of Virginia," *American Antiquarian Society, Proceedings* (n.s.) 41:77-178 (1931); William S. Lester, *The Transylvania Colony* (Spencer, Ind., 1935); George E. Lewis, *The Indiana Company, 1763-1798* (Glendale, Calif., 1941); Max Saville, *George Morgan, Colony Builder* (New York, 1932).

¹⁹ Paul Wallace Gates, "The Role of the Land Speculator in Western Development," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 66:314-333 (1942).

well. Few pioneers could have purchased land without the help of jobbers before the middle of the nineteenth century.

Proof of their valuable rôle can be found in the history of the national land laws. Each measure passed after the initial Ordinance of 1785 was in response to western pressure and was designed to eliminate speculators by depriving them of their functions. This was the purpose of the credit system that was introduced into government sales by the acts of 1796 and 1800, of the gradual reduction in the minimum amount purchasable, and of preemption. Yet none succeeded. The professional land jobbers could still seek out the most productive sites, and they could still offer smaller down payments and easier credit terms than the land office. Even after the Preemption Act of 1841 was passed, their activities continued, for few pioneers could accumulate sufficient cash to pay for their farms in the few years allowed them and were forced to borrow from speculators, serving now in the new rôle of "loan sharks," or lose their lands and improvements. Only the

Homestead Act deprived the jobbers of their principal function and reduced them to the less valuable task of engrossing the railroad, mineral, and forest lands for their own selfish ends.

Clearly the speculators played an important part in the conquest of the frontier and in the larger scene of the Nation's history. Forging steadily ahead to mark out the best lands, pleading always with purchasers for long-overdue payments, suffering risks that reduced their profits to a minimum,²⁰ and enduring the hatred that the frontiersmen reserved for tax collectors, absentee landlords, and others who tried to wring cash from flat western pocketbooks, they were as omnipresent along the cutting edge of civilization as the axe-swinging pioneers themselves. Their contribution to the frontier process deserves more attention than it has received.

²⁰ One careful study for a later period shows that the majority of a group of speculators averaged less than 5 percent profit. James W. Silver, "Land Speculation Profits in the Chickasaw Cession," *Journal of Southern History*, 10:84-92 (1944).

THE AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT OF LOWER CANADA, 1850-1867

ROBERT LESLIE JONES

Department of History and Political Science, Marietta College

In the second quarter of the nineteenth century, the seigneuries of Lower Canada suffered from a chronic agricultural depression attributable to several factors. Wheat, theretofore the staple of the St. Lawrence Valley, was ravaged year after year by the midge. Of the other common crops, barley and oats had only limited domestic markets and peas a fluctuating overseas one. Although horses were saleable to American traders, other kinds of livestock offered no satisfactory alternative to grain growing, for the markets at Montreal and Quebec were often glutted with American cattle, sheep, pork, and cheese. With their peasant-like persistence in the farming methods of the eighteenth century, the habitants seemed condemned to deepening penury on their ancestral holdings. It was no wonder that every responsible political and clerical leader admitted that the agricultural outlook of the overwhelming majority of the population of Lower Canada at mid-century was thoroughly discouraging.¹

¹ Robert Leslie Jones, "French-Canadian Agriculture in the St. Lawrence Valley, 1815-1850," *Agricultural History*, 16:141-148 (Washington, 1942).

The English and Scottish farmers around Montreal also suffered from the influx of staples from the basin of the Great Lakes, but their propinquity to the city made it possible for them to take immediate advantage of any rise in prices and to concentrate on the specialized farming developed in response to urban demand. That they would find an answer to American competition could not be doubted, for it was commonplace to note the superiority of the agricultural practices in Argenteuil, Beauharnois, and Huntingdon counties and on Montreal and Jesus islands to those in the French-Canadian parishes. Especially on the two islands the British settlers had acceptable crop rotations; they manured abundantly, they underdrained, and they acquired improved livestock. They often made farms which had been worn out by their habitant predecessors worthy of comparison with the best in England or the Scottish Lowlands.²

² *L'Agriculteur* (Montreal), septembre 1859, 12, octobre 1859, 25; *Revue Agricole, Manufacturière, Commerciale et de Colonisation* (Montreal), octobre 1861, 6.

The Eastern Townships adjacent to Vermont and New Hampshire likewise were not seriously threatened by outside competition. Their agricultural development followed closely the patterns of the hill country of northern New England, for the inhabitants were mostly of American ancestry, and the rolling countryside with its frequently sandy and stony soil was much better adapted to pasturage than to grain growing. When the raising of horses became important in Vermont during the 1820s, there was in the Eastern Townships "a good breed of English [*i.e.*, not French-Canadian] horses, which are rapidly increasing in number, because the farmers find them profitable as an article of trade."³ In the 1830s the Merino craze of northern Vermont was reflected in the Eastern Townships by the importation of Merinos in considerable numbers from Vermont, New York, and even Massachusetts.⁴ It is probable, however, that cattle raising was ordinarily the chief industry. During the early thirties cattle were usually bracketed with horses as the leading articles of export of the Townships,⁵ and in 1839 a traveler in the Stanstead vicinity stated that "farmers in this and neighbouring Townships at an average raise 25 head Cattle per year: good size oxen now sell here at \$80 per pair for cash; the Americans have bought up at least 5000 head of Cattle in the Townships and Seigneuries this year paying cash for the same. And nigh 2000 head have been driven by Mr. Longley, Cattle dealer, from hence to Montreal."⁶ The rapid expansion of both cheese and butter dairying in the northern Vermont counties of Addison, Chittenden, and Franklin which paralleled the decline of fine-wool growing

had its counterpart in the Eastern Townships. By 1850 some of the farmers in Missisquoi County, for example, were selling £100 worth of cheese of their own manufacture in Montreal every spring.⁷ The evidence available indicates that in spite of their unsatisfactory means of communication with the towns along the St. Lawrence River the inhabitants of the Eastern Townships held their own there in livestock and dairy products against their New York and Vermont rivals.

The present article describes the development of St. Lawrence Valley agriculture from mid-century to the entrance of Lower Canada into the Dominion of Canada as the Province of Quebec on July 1, 1867. The closing date is not an arbitrary political one, for the period was given an economic unity by trade relations with the United States before and during the reciprocity years, 1854-1866.

The economic depression in Lower Canada reached its nadir during the late 1840s. The British mercantile classes in Montreal were advocating annexation to the United States as a remedy for the situation in which the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 left the forwarding trade and the milling industry of the St. Lawrence system. The timber industry of the Ottawa Valley was at the bottom of one of its cycles between 1847 and 1849. The habitants were producing scarcely enough to feed themselves in consequence of the recurring failure of their wheat and potato crops. Nothing more clearly reveals the hopelessness of their position than the fact that William Evans, the leading agricultural authority of Lower Canada, could suggest no better course for them than to keep on with their wheat growing in spite of the midge because wheat alone was certain of a market.⁸

The first evidence of a lifting of the depression came in the autumn of 1848 when the agricultural press began to notice an abnormal export of horses to the United States.⁹ The trade in work horses of every description continued unabated throughout 1849, 1850, and 1851 in spite of the 20 percent duty on Canadian agricultural produce entering the United States, with the result that by 1852 it

³ Joseph Bouchette, *The British Dominions in North America*, 1, "Shipton" (London, 1832).

⁴ Ezra A. Carman, H. A. Heath, and John Minto, *Special Report on the History and Present Condition of the Sheep Industry in the United States*, 343-344 (Washington, 1892).

⁵ Bouchette, *British Dominions*, 1, "Eaton"; *Montreal Canadian Courant*, Jan. 26, 1831; *Quebec Gazette*, quoted in *Montreal Gazette*, Oct. 16, 1834.

⁶ Henry Taylor, *Journal of a Tour from Montreal, thro' Berthier and Sorel, to the Eastern Townships* 39 (Quebec, 1840). The exporting of cattle from the Eastern Townships to the United States here referred to was quite exceptional, as was a similar development in Upper Canada at the same time. Robert Leslie Jones, "The Canadian Agricultural Tariff of 1843," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 7:534 (Toronto, 1941).

⁷ J. B. Brown, *Views of Canada and the Colonists*, 392 (ed. 2, Edinburgh, 1851).

⁸ Lower Canada Agricultural Society, *Agricultural Journal and Transactions*, (Montreal), July 1848, 193-194.

⁹ *Ibid.*, October 1848, 307, April 1849, 122.

was accepted that not only could the new level be maintained indefinitely but it could be raised almost without limit.¹⁰ Though the demand was to be ascribed primarily to the shortage of horses in the Eastern States created by the Mexican War and aggravated by the rapidly developing construction of railroads, an important factor was the admitted superiority of the French-Canadian horse.¹¹

During the summer of 1849 there also began to be evidence of a considerable demand in both Lower and Upper Canada for cattle to export to the United States.¹² Till that time American competition in the Montreal market had seemed to render the hope of any such development illusory. Only a few forward-looking individuals saw that when cheap land for the raising of cattle in the eastern United States was no longer available the consumers of the seaboard urban centers would turn to the Province of Canada for part of their meat supply.¹³ The low prices for cattle prevailing in Canada in consequence of the depression had something to do with deflecting the cattle trade from an import to an export basis but probably less than the high prices for beef at New York early in 1849.¹⁴ Not many cattle were exported from Lower Canada to New York and Boston in the next few years—only a few thousand head according to the very inaccurate returns of entries at the American customs ports south of Montreal¹⁵—but certainly the number

would increase, for Lower Canada, like Upper Canada, Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois was manifestly becoming tributary to the cattle-fattening areas of the Eastern States.

Sheep had hitherto been of little economic importance in Lower Canada, aside from the brief Merino furor in the Eastern Townships. Now their value, like that of horses and cattle, was magnified through the development of an American outlet. During 1849–50 some Lower Canada sheep and lambs appeared at the Cambridge, Massachusetts, cattle market, and by the end of 1851 fat sheep for export were in steady request at Montreal.¹⁶

Rising prices for coarse grains in the United States in the late 1840s were responsible for the inauguration of an export trade in oats and barley from Lower Canada. The production of coarse grains in Lower Canada was at this time tending to fall off owing to the unsatisfactory domestic market for them, especially, it was said, after Father Chiniquy began his temperance crusade among the habitants.¹⁷ During the winter of 1848–49 oats were selling at Montreal for from 20 to 26 cents a bushel, or less than the estimated cost of production. During the next autumn, however, considerable quantities were exported to the United States, and the new market in succeeding years never lost its importance.¹⁸ Little barley was sent southward till the winter of 1850–51, when the agents of American brewers appeared at Montreal and made large shipments. This trade expanded steadily thereafter.¹⁹

Other Lower Canada farm products of no former commercial significance became items of export to the United States during 1850 and 1851. In their case the dominating factor was not so much rising prices south of the border—though these had a bearing on it—as improved communication through the construction of railroads linking Montreal with American lines already completed. During the summer of 1850 one railroad opened through communication via Plattsburg with the

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, November 1849, 339, April 1852, 119; Société d'Agriculture du Bas-Canada, *Journal d'Agriculture et Transactions* (Montreal), février 1851, 50, avril 1851, 117–118.

¹¹ "The difference of the quality of the horses in New York and in Montreal is very striking, and we believe very much in favour of our horses, for carting or ordinary purposes. Our horses may not stand so high on their limbs, but their shape and capabilities for work we conceive to be much superior to those of New York." *Agricultural Journal*, November 1849, 339.

¹² *Canadian Agriculturist* (Toronto), Aug. 1, 1849, 198; *Toronto Globe* (triweekly), Mar. 5, 1850.

¹³ *Agricultural Journal*, April 1849, 122.

¹⁴ Percy W. Bidwell and John I. Falconer, *History of Agriculture in the Northern United States, 1620–1860*, 315 (Washington, 1925).

¹⁵ Israel D. Andrews, "Report... on the Trade and Commerce of the British North American Colonies, and upon the Trade of the Great Lakes and Rivers," 32 Congress, 1 Session, 1852–53, *House Executive Document 136*, p. 474, 476. There was notoriously a great amount of smuggling in livestock.

¹⁶ *New England Farmer* (Boston), Nov. 9, 1850, 366; *Journal d'Agriculture*, janvier 1852, 24.

¹⁷ *Agricultural Journal*, October 1848, 291.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, March 1849, 81, 83, November 1849, 339, September 1851, 278; *Journal d'Agriculture*, février 1851, 50, juillet 1852, 193–194.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, février 1851, 50, juin 1851, 183, mars 1852, 91; *Agricultural Journal*, October 1851, 310, January 1852, 25.

Hudson Valley and in 1851 another line connecting with the Vermont Central gave access to both Boston and New York. Among the articles immediately affected by the advent of the railroads were eggs and poultry. Between May 1 and June 15, 1850, 201,600 dozen eggs were packed for export to the United States at the Bonsécours market in Montreal and about 25,000 dozen at the Ste. Anne market. During the next few months hens and other fowl were likewise bought for American account. The traffic—especially that in eggs—was one which tended to keep pace with the improvement in communications with the United States and with the rising demand in Boston and New York.²⁰ Butter was exported to New York and New England beginning in 1850, mostly from the Eastern Townships.²¹ Even hay, heretofore scarcely worth hauling into Montreal, began to climb in price in 1852 as a result of the opening of the railroads connecting with the Eastern States.²²

By the end of 1851 the "New England market" was regarded by Lower Canada authorities as solidly established. "The United States, we believe, will be our best customers," William Evans pointed out, "and of course we cannot expect this custom from favor, but because that country wants what we can give them, and at a cheaper rate than they can obtain them elsewhere, in consequence of our relative position, and the easy means of communication."²³ Later he wrote: "There is no doubt that our market for horses, cattle, sheep, pork, and butter, is likely to improve, rather than get worse, notwithstanding the heavy duty that is payable on these products, on importation into the United States. . . . When we came to Canada [about 1830], there was a large importation of horses, beef, pork, mutton, cheese, poultry and other things to this country from the United States. The case is now exactly reversed, and we send all these articles to the United States, and there is every probability that this new market is likely to increase every day."²⁴

One of the first consequences of the opening of

the New England market was a more widespread agitation for reciprocity in natural products with the United States,²⁵ a proposal which had been under consideration for several years and which was put in operation by the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. Another consequence was a feeling of well-being throughout rural Lower Canada, even in the French-Canadian portions, though the wheat crops there were a succession of failures and the price of the grain actually harvested was too low to warrant its being exported overseas.²⁶ Evans asserted that the prospects of the French-Canadian farmers were better than they had been at any time since the advent of the wheat midge.²⁷ This was on account of the fact that the habitants began to emphasize the production of cereals other than wheat. By the season of 1852 it could be remarked that "the cultivation of oats has become very extensive in the county and district of Quebec."²⁸ Though, as will be shown later, the American market had little effect on French-Canadian agricultural technique, the circumstance that oats, barley, livestock, and other products were readily saleable meant that the condition of the habitants economically was much better than it had been only a few years earlier.

From 1853 to 1857 there was a greater demand for agricultural produce than ever before. This arose from the requirements of the gangs working on the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway, from the shutting off of Baltic and Black Sea grain from Great Britain during the Crimean War of 1854-56, and from the wild boom in the United States which culminated in the crisis of 1857. The admission of the natural products of British North America into the United States free of duty after March 16, 1855, under the terms of the Reciprocity Treaty merely facilitated the extension of a thoroughly established trade. Never before had the farmers of Lower Canada possessed the advantages of expanding local, overseas, and American markets. There was in consequence indubitably some speculative activity in parts of Lower Canada, but it failed to reach the proportions that it did in the United States and Upper Canada. This was partly because the habitants were as conservative as ever and partly because coarse grains did not soar in price as did

²⁰ *Journal d'Agriculture*, juillet 1850, 216, août 1850, 254, juin 1851, 183, juin 1852, 161.

²¹ Andrews, "Report," 252, 475; *Agricultural Journal*, September 1852, 281.

²² *Ibid.*, October 1852, 313; *Canadian Agriculturist*, December 1852, 363.

²³ *Agricultural Journal*, November 1851, 346.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, April 1852, 123.

²⁵ *Journal d'Agriculture*, février 1851, 50.

²⁶ *Agricultural Journal*, November 1851, 346.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, November 1852, 350.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, October 1852, 315.

wheat, the Upper Canada staple. The result was that the depression of 1857-60, which prostrated Upper Canada no less than the adjacent States, was little felt in Lower Canada.²⁹

The tendencies in Lower Canada agriculture developed before the Reciprocity Treaty and during the first years of its operation were even more in evidence in the period of the American Civil War. The Civil War had revolutionary effects on the agriculture of the Northern States, and the close economic relationship between the Province of Canada and the consuming centers to the south meant that Canadian agriculture could not fail to be influenced. Upper Canada was more responsive to the new situation than Lower Canada because it had a greater cultural affinity with the United States and because its farmers were better prepared to take advantage of market changes,³⁰ but there was nevertheless an important reaction in Lower Canada, particularly in the Eastern Townships.

The least important reflection of the Civil War was in connection with special crops. The student with the parallels between Upper Canada and the Northern States in mind will find no more than an occasional mention of the growing of hops, tobacco, and sorghum.³¹ Only flax attracted serious attention. Flax had been almost abandoned even by the habitants before 1850 in consequence of the lack of a local market for straw or for more than a small amount of seed, but now it was thought desirable to revive its culture to make up for the cutting off of the supply of southern cotton. Early in 1862 the government of the Province of Canada imported six scutching machines and assigned three of them to Lower Canada—one to the recently established agricultural school at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière and the other two to agricultural societies at Sher-

brooke and Montreal. At the same time the Board of Agriculture of Lower Canada granted \$100 to each of the custodians of the machines to purchase seed for distribution in their neighborhoods. In addition a number of farmers, including a very few French Canadians, were induced by propaganda or self-interest to try flax on their own account. In 1863 a small quantity of straw—less than 100 tons—was produced in Compton County, where the British American Land Company had supplied seed to the farmers and agreed to purchase the flax at a fair market price. In 1864 and 1865 some of the agricultural societies were persuaded to subsidize the purchase of seed by their members, but the seed was so high in price and so patently poor in germinating qualities from having been kiln-dried that most of the farmers refused to pay for what they had ordered. By this time the demand for flax had diminished as a result of the opening of the Mississippi River, and with the prejudice against it there was no hope for the industry.³²

Infinitely more important than the experimentation with flax was the expansion of the grain trade with the United States during the Civil War and the year following. The grains grown in Lower Canada which were most in demand were, as in the preceding decade, oats and barley. The exports of oats through the "Vermont" and "Champlain" customs ports by fiscal years were as follows: 1861-62, 1,545,178 bushels valued at \$453,048; 1862-63, 2,460,094 bushels at \$997,663; 1863-64, 8,589,253 bushels at \$2,399,254; 1864-65, 4,026,440 bushels at \$1,776,963; and 1865-66 (8½ months), an unspecified quantity valued at \$843,406. The oats were mostly—possibly almost altogether—the produce of Lower Canada. The exports of barley for the same fiscal periods were 462,272 bushels valued at \$254,724, 671,008 bushels valued at \$530,138, 779,150 bushels valued at \$637,931, 819,124 bushels valued at \$721,160, and an unspecified quantity valued at \$668,352.³³ Presumably all this barley was grown in Lower Canada. These exports marked a solidifying of

²⁹ *Montreal Witness* (biweekly), Apr. 4, 1857, Apr. 2, 1859, Jan. 5, 1861.

³⁰ See Fred Landon, "Some Effects of the American Civil War on Canadian Agriculture," *Agricultural History*, 7:163-169 (1933).

³¹ The failure to devote much attention to sorghum ("Chinese Sugar-Cane") as a substitute for sugar was largely accounted for by the expansion of the maple-sugar industry in the Eastern Townships. By 1862 farms there were being advertised for sale with such items as "very good sugary," "sugary of 350 trees," "25 acres of good sugary," and "good sugar house with 700 buckets." *Advantages of the Eastern Townships for Emigrants of all Classes*, 26-29 (Sherbrooke, 1862).

³² *Revue Agricole*, avril 1862, 169, 172, mai 1862, 197, mars-avril 1863, 217, décembre 1865, 84, mai 1866, 230; *Canada Farmer* (Toronto), Apr. 1, 1864, 82.

³³ 37 Cong., 3 Sess., 1862-63, *House Exec. Doc.*, 13:239-240; 38 Cong., 1 Sess., 1863-64, *House Exec. Doc.*, 17:235-236; 38 Cong., 2 Sess., 1864-65, *House Exec. Doc.*, 15:275-276; 39 Cong., 1 Sess., 1865-66, *House Exec. Doc.*, 17:543, 545; 39 Cong., 2 Sess., 1866-67, *House Exec. Doc.*, 17:385-386.

the position of the Lower Canadian barley growers in the brewers' market at Albany. The trade would have developed these proportions, however, without the impetus afforded by the Civil War, for the farmers in the Mohawk Valley, long the foremost barley-growing region in the Union, were abandoning barley and so leaving a vacuum which the Canadian exporters were able to fill. This is evident from the fact that in the autumn of 1859 no less than 600,000 bushels of barley had been shipped from Lower Canada to Albany,³⁴ and that in 1862 only 500,000 bushels of the 2,814,000 received at Albany was the produce of New York, most of the balance coming from the Province of Canada.³⁵ It was a consequence of steady American demand that before the end of the Civil War oats and barley became "the chief staples of a large portion of Upper Canada [oats chiefly in eastern Upper Canada] and we may say of all Lower Canada."³⁶

One of the effects of the Civil War on Lower Canada was an increased demand for horses. In a single day in November 1861, 43 horses were shipped from Montreal for the Federal cavalry.³⁷ The next year it was mentioned that "some of the [Eastern] townships, such as Stanstead and Hatley, are famed for the excellent horses that are bred there, and which command very high prices in the United States."³⁸ These were not French-Canadian horses but crosses of various British and

Vermont breeds. French-Canadian horses were, however, still so popular in the Northern States that in some of the border counties of New York farmers imported stallions from the St. Lawrence Valley in order that they might have colts to sell farther south in competition with those brought in from Lower Canada.³⁹ The bad consequences of this continued exportation of the French-Canadian horse will be pointed out later.

There was a marked growth in the export trade in cattle during the Civil War, particularly in the Eastern Townships. The cattle here were much superior to those kept by the habitants because there was a considerable amount of up-grading from imported breeds. As throughout the late 1850s, the cattle met readiest sale at Boston and Portland, the eastern terminus of the Grand Trunk Railway. The industry was sufficiently important to justify holding a monthly cattle and sheep fair at Sherbrooke.⁴⁰ Immediately after the Civil War, when there was a shortage of cattle in the Northern States owing to the drainage southward of all that were available, the exporting of cattle from Lower Canada was extraordinarily brisk. It was noted that "Butchers and speculators are stocking the mountain pastures of New Hampshire extensively with Canadian cattle."⁴¹

In Lower Canada, as in the Northern States and Upper Canada, there was expansion in the dairy industry during the Civil War. During the 1850s dairying in the Eastern Townships had kept abreast of developments in Vermont. Many dairymen in this region produced such good butter that they were able to sell it for cash at their own doors for export to New England instead of turning it over to the storekeepers in trade.⁴² They were accordingly in a position to benefit especially from the Civil War, though of course they were not the only farmers to do so, for the worst kind of dairy produce was saleable during those years. They shipped much more butter than cheese. The cheese cleared through the Vermont and Champlain ports of entry by fiscal years was as follows: 1861-62, 114,047 pounds valued at \$8,298; 1862-63,

³⁴ *Canadian Agriculturist*, June 1, 1860, 246.

³⁵ *Country Gentleman* (Albany) quoted in *Genesee Farmer* (Rochester), May 1863, 150.

³⁶ *Montreal Witness*, Jan. 21, 1865. The production of coarse grains in Lower Canada increased from about 12,000,000 bushels in 1851 to about 23,500,000 in 1861. *Revue Agricole*, novembre 1862, 50.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, décembre 1861, 87. There is no way of ascertaining the exact number of horses exported to the United States during the reciprocity period, because horses, cattle, sheep, etc. were lumped together statistically simply as "live animals" with a rough monetary valuation. The estimated values of the "live animals" cleared through the Vermont and Champlain customs ports were: 1861-62, \$580,979; 1862-63, \$605,210; 1863-64, \$1,006,001; 1864-65, \$1,173,551; and 1865-66, \$2,147,700. Some allowance must be made in these statistics for the currency inflation in the United States. 37 Cong., 3 Sess., 1862-63, *House Exec. Doc.*, 13:234; 38 Cong., 1 Sess., 1863-64, *House Exec. Doc.*, 17:230; 38 Cong., 2 Sess., 1864-65, *House Exec. Doc.*, 15:270; 39 Cong., 1 Sess., 1865-66, *House Exec. Doc.*, 17:538; 39 Cong., 2 Sess., 1866-67, *House Exec. Doc.*, 17:382.

³⁸ *Advantages of the Eastern Townships*, 7.

³⁹ *Country Gentleman*, quoted in *Canada Farmer*, May 16, 1864, 135.

⁴⁰ *Advantages of the Eastern Townships*, 7, 23, 33; *Lower Canada Agriculturist* (Montreal), October 1862, 7-8.

⁴¹ *Canada Farmer*, July 15, 1865, 213.

⁴² *Canadian Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review* (Toronto), May 1858, 161.

19,092 pounds at \$1,594; 1863-64, 292,923 pounds at \$25,661; 1864-65, 378,855 pounds at \$29,849; and 1865-66 (8½ months), an unstated quantity valued at \$21,073. During the same years there were cleared 2,124,570 pounds of butter valued at \$263,087, 1,605,322 pounds valued at \$245,199, 1,919,958 pounds valued at \$344,762, 2,718,067 pounds valued at \$514,232, and an unstated amount valued at \$1,020,603.⁴³ Before the end of the Civil War, Eastern Townships butter acquired such a reputation for superiority that, as was remarked a few years later, it was "very seldom handled by Canadian buyers at all...being generally contracted for by Americans before a pound of it is gathered, shipped to Boston, re-branded and sold for the highest price under the name of 'Vermont Dairy'."⁴⁴ It was also in the Eastern Townships that the first cheese factory in Lower Canada was opened. In 1864 a native with twenty-five years' experience in dairy cheese making began to operate a factory on the Herkimer County, New York, model in Missisquoi County. This factory had the milk of 500 cows pledged to it in 1865 and of 900 in 1867.⁴⁵ By the end of 1866, 11 additional cheese factories were completed in Lower Canada, all in the English-speaking districts.⁴⁶

The butchers of New York and New England continued during the Civil War to obtain many of their fat sheep from Lower Canada, but seemingly the farmers in the Eastern Townships saw better prospects in wool than mutton. Certainly they were strongly influenced by the fine-wool mania then sweeping Vermont. The increasing popularity of fine-wool sheep among them was illustrated by the entries at the provincial (Lower Canada) exhibitions of 1863 and 1865. While at the first there were only 6 Saxon Merinos in competition, at the second there were 49 Spanish and

Saxon Merinos.⁴⁷ The exports of wool through the Vermont and Champlain customs ports grew till the end of the reciprocity period. By fiscal years, they were: 1861-62, 501,051 pounds valued at \$161,044; 1862-63, 734,136 pounds at \$313,784; 1863-64, 613,260 pounds at \$293,054; 1864-65, 1,023,277 pounds at \$472,765, and 1865-66 (8½ months), an unstated quantity valued at \$482,420.⁴⁸ Much wool was also sold in Canada, for a domestic market steadily developed as more woolen factories came into operation.

So extensive were the exports to the United States of coarse grains, livestock, poultry, eggs, and butter during 1865-66 that the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty in March 1866 caused little immediate concern. "The high prices the Americans have been paying lead to the opinion that no serious effects of the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty will be felt for years at least," it was reported.⁴⁹ Such effects were only too evident within a year or two, when most Lower Canada prices became the United States prices less the ordinary 25-percent duty.⁵⁰ It is true that the export trade in horses, barley, and Eastern Townships butter was not greatly upset by the restoration of the American tariff but that in other products soon virtually ended. The post-reciprocity agricultural adjustment of Lower Canada need not concern us here, however, for it closely paralleled that of Upper Canada as described elsewhere.⁵¹

A common accompaniment of rising prosperity in agriculture has been the construction of better farm buildings, the acquisition of improved implements, and the introduction of purebred livestock. It is, therefore, not surprising to find that one result of the prosperity of Lower Canada during the 1850s was the introduction of improved cattle on a much larger scale than ever before. It was stated, for example, that in 1858 "the im-

⁴³ 37 Cong., 3 Sess., 1862-63, *House Exec. Doc.*, 13:235; 38 Cong., 1 Sess., 1863-64, *House Exec. Doc.*, 17:231; 38 Cong., 2 Sess., 1864-65, *House Exec. Doc.*, 15:271; 39 Cong., 1 Sess., 1865-66, *House Exec. Doc.*, 17:539; 39 Cong., 2 Sess., 1866-67, *House Exec. Doc.*, 17:382-383.

⁴⁴ *Canada Farmer*, July 15, 1872, 260.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, Jan. 16, 1865, 20; *Bedford Times*, quoted in *ibid.*, May 1, 1867, 135.

⁴⁶ H. A. Innis and A. R. M. Lower, eds., *Select Documents in Canadian Economic History, 1783-1885*, 561 (Toronto, 1933).

⁴⁷ *Revue Agricole*, septembre 1863, 283, mai 1866, 228.

⁴⁸ 37 Cong., 3 Sess., 1862-63, *House Exec. Doc.*, 13:244; 38 Cong., 1 Sess., 1863-64, *House Exec. Doc.*, 17:241; 38 Cong., 2 Sess., 1864-65, *House Exec. Doc.*, 15:280; 39 Cong., 1 Sess., 1865-66, *House Exec. Doc.*, 17:549; 39 Cong., 2 Sess., 1866-67, *House Exec. Doc.*, 17:389.

⁴⁹ *Montreal Witness*, Jan. 17, 1866.

⁵⁰ *Revue Agricole*, mars 1868, 166.

⁵¹ See Robert Leslie Jones, *History of Agriculture in Ontario to 1880*, ch. 14-16 (University of Toronto Press, forthcoming).

portations of improved animals were multiplied in a remarkable fashion."⁵² Most of the improved cattle were to be found in the advanced British section around Montreal. Shorthorns were much less common than in Upper Canada or the Northern States, and the most that could be said for the Devons was that they were met with often enough to deserve mention.⁵³ Ayrshires were the most popular breed, as they had been since the 1820s. At the provincial exhibition of 1858 there were 30 Ayrshire bulls exhibited, or over twice as many as those of all other breeds combined, and 40 Ayrshire cows and heifers, as compared with 70 cows and heifers of all other breeds. Many, possibly most, of these Ayrshires were imported during the preceding year, a fact which led to the comment that breeders had finally made up their minds as to the improved cattle best suited to Lower Canada.⁵⁴ By 1860, too, the County of Montreal Agricultural Society owned no fewer than 8 Ayrshire bulls, and by 1864 Ayrshire blood was manifest in every herd in Beauharnois County.⁵⁵ No attempt was made at this time to improve by selection the native cattle of Lower Canada. These were commonly condemned as being inferior and profitless but fair-minded critics asserted—as has since been fully established—that they would be as valuable in the dairy as any foreign breed which could be introduced, provided they were properly fed and sheltered.⁵⁶

There was very little improvement in swine even in the advanced parts of Lower Canada owing to lack of markets. The chief breeds represented at the provincial exhibitions in the 1860s were the large and the small Berkshires, the large York-

shires, and the small Suffolks.⁵⁷ These were the popular improved breeds in Upper Canada as well. Though a few crossbred representatives of these breeds appeared at some of the local exhibitions, it was only in such regions as Beauharnois County that there was much evidence that the landpike or razorback was being superseded.⁵⁸

The situation was better with respect to sheep. Though, as previously mentioned, there was something of a rage for fine-wool sheep in the Eastern Townships during the American Civil War, the popular sheep among the improving British farmers in the Montreal region were the Leicesters, Cotswolds, and Southdowns.⁵⁹ Throughout the English-speaking parts of Quebec the mutton breeds were "fast superseding" the natives and Merinos by 1870.⁶⁰

The greatest gains in breeding were made in connection with horses. In the Eastern Townships the tendency was to raise light-draft horses. Here, as was likewise the case in Vermont, the chief improved strain was the Morgan.⁶¹ On Montreal Island and in the southwestern corner of Lower Canada the Clydesdale was almost as popular as in Upper Canada, where it had the heavy-draft field practically to itself. In Beauharnois County the importation of several Clydesdale stallions beginning in 1861 was said to have doubled the value of the horses in the county between 1864 and 1868, and similar results were observable in Hochelaga County.⁶² There were a few Suffolk Punches in Lower Canada in the 1860s, their main advantage as far as the farmers were concerned being that their feet were much better than those of the Clydesdale.⁶³ The Clydesdale also had the disadvantage, according to the agri-

⁵² *L'Agriculteur*, janvier 1859, 99.

⁵³ *Revue Agricole*, octobre 1864, 7. An idea of the relative popularity of the various breeds of cattle may be obtained from the entries at the Lower Canada provincial exhibitions of 1863 and 1865. In 1863 there were 65 Shorthorns, 12 Herefords, 30 Devons, 76 Ayrshires, and 27 Galloways, and in 1865 there were 89 Durhams, 27 Herefords, 60 Devons, 104 Ayrshires, and 13 Galloways. These figures are somewhat misleading, of course, because most of the animals shown were the property of breeders who appreciated the value of a premium for advertising. *Ibid.*, septembre 1863, 283; mai 1866, 228.

⁵⁴ *L'Agriculteur*, octobre 1858, 25.

⁵⁵ *Canadian Agriculturist*, Nov. 1, 1860, 562; *Revue Agricole*, octobre 1864, 7.

⁵⁶ *L'Agriculteur*, mars 1859, 157-158.

⁵⁷ *Revue Agricole*, septembre 1863, 283, mai 1866, 228.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, octobre 1864, 7, novembre 1867, 45.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, octobre 1864, 7. The entries at the provincial exhibitions of 1863 and 1865 give some gauge of the popularity of sheep: Leicesters, 90 and 141; Cotswolds, 31 and 55; various longwools (crossbred), 42 and 145; Southdowns, 18 and 69; Cheviots, 10 and 62; Merinos and Saxon Merinos, 6 and 49; Hampshire Downs, 0 and 8. *Ibid.*, septembre 1863, 283, mai 1866, 228.

⁶⁰ *Cultivator* (Albany), quoted in Carman, *Special Report*, 346.

⁶¹ *Revue Agricole*, octobre 1862, 7.

⁶² *Ibid.*, mars 1862, 145, novembre 1867, 45, mai 1868, 237.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, octobre 1864, 6, avril 1868, 209.

cultural experts, that it did not cross satisfactorily with the French-Canadian horse.⁶⁴

The most urgent necessity was to improve the common horse of the habitants, for in the 1850s and 1860s the French-Canadian horse as a recognized breed deteriorated almost to the point of extinction. It was a frequent complaint that the best stallions were driven to the United States and that the horses obtained in exchange were the scalawags of New York and New England. In 1865 the Board of Agriculture of Lower Canada offered a prize at the provincial exhibition for the best French-Canadian horse, and of the 22 entries not one was of pure stock.⁶⁵ Early in 1868 the Board considered a suggestion that a commission should search Quebec for stallions of the pure French-Canadian breed and that these, when located, should be purchased for sale to the agricultural societies. It was admitted that only in Rimouski, Saguenay, Gaspé, or Chicoutimi was there much prospect of finding such stallions, for the Americans had taken every available animal from the other localities. When the men representing these counties in the legislature declared that there were no such horses along the lower St. Lawrence, the Board regretfully concluded that to find a pure French-Canadian stallion in Quebec would be extraordinarily difficult—equivalent indeed to *chercher le merle blanc*.⁶⁶ Some breeders felt, however, that the French-Canadian horse might be reestablished by importing stock akin to that from which the horses of New France had been derived. They considered three breeds suitable for the purpose—the Anglo-Norman, the Breton, and the Percheron. In 1866 an Anglo-Norman stallion was imported by the Huntingdon County Agricultural Society. Two Bretons were imported into Chateauguay County the same year, one by the agricultural society, and the other by a private individual.⁶⁷ These and later Anglo-Normans and Bretons proved less popular than Percherons, which, though much larger, had the advantage of more closely resembling pure French-Canadian horses. Although there had been some talk of importing Percherons as early as 1858, the first were brought into Lower Canada by the agricultural societies of Beauharnois and Verchères counties in 1866. Early the next year the Assomp-

tion County Agricultural Society imported one. It was the first entirely French-Canadian society to do so. Five in all were imported before the end of 1867, the other two being obtained by the agricultural societies of Quebec and Rouville.⁶⁸ Other importations followed till ultimately there was the hoped-for improvement in the French-Canadian horse.

Save for the belated interest in the betterment of the French-Canadian horse just mentioned and the adoption to some extent of British mutton sheep,⁶⁹ there was scant evidence of agricultural improvement among the habitants between mid-century and Confederation. In the 1850s the defects of French-Canadian farming were what they had long been—poor preparation of the soil, little or no fertilizing, no crop rotation, no cleaning out of weeds by hoed crops or even by summer fallowing, no underdraining, and defective care of livestock.⁷⁰ J. Perrault, editor of *L'Agriculteur*, who traveled from Montreal to Kamouraska through the heart of French Canada in 1859, found ancient practices the only ones known, and four years later he was forced to make a similar observation about the parishes along the North Shore near Quebec.⁷¹ It was only in a few places, such as along the New York border, where the French Canadians had the benefit of seeing what English-speaking farmers were accomplishing, that there were signs of improvement in their livestock and its care, in the initiation of better methods of cultivation, or in general, of progress.⁷² Elsewhere, even in the 1870s, the visitor found little that was encouraging in habitant agriculture. In 1874 Edward Barnard reported: "I have visited parishes which at one time were amongst the most fertile in the country; on farms which produced wheat with an extreme abundance for many years, nothing will grow but thin oats; the ditches are not kept up, water lies on the meadows in the fall, and consequently a considerable proportion is destroyed with the winter frosts. The stock is

⁶⁸ *L'Agriculteur*, avril 1859, 171; *Revue Agricole*, mars 1862, 143, janvier 1867, 99, février 1867, 134, octobre 1867, 9, novembre 1867, 39, avril 1868, 209.

⁶⁹ *L'Agriculteur*, novembre 1858, 49, avril 1859, 177.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, avril 1859, 175–178; William Evans, *Review of the Agriculture of Lower Canada with Suggestions for its Amelioration*, 4, 29 (Montreal, 1856).

⁷¹ *L'Agriculteur*, octobre 1859, 25; *Revue Agricole*, avril 1864, 200–201.

⁷² *Ibid.*, juin 1862, 248.

⁶⁴ *L'Agriculteur*, septembre 1858, 5.

⁶⁵ *Revue Agricole*, mai 1866, 229.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, juin 1868, 272.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, janvier 1867, 99, février 1867, 134.

very badly wintered, and it has generally no better food than the miserable weeds which grow on the hard-baked ruined soil."⁷³ The habitants had few modern implements. In 1870 Ontario with 172,000 farmers had 37,000 reapers and mowers whereas Quebec with 118,000 farmers had only 5,100, nearly all in the Montreal region or the Eastern Townships. Among the French-Canadian counties Beauce had 5, L'Islet 5, Lotbinière 6, Megantic 8, Portneuf 12, Arthabaska 20, Bellechasse 22, Joliette 23, Berthier 24, Montmagny 26, Richelieu 31, and the others somewhat larger, though still insignificant, numbers.⁷⁴ Beauce and Megantic were newly colonized counties, but some of the others mentioned, like Portneuf and Lotbinière, were among the oldest in the St. Lawrence Valley. In general the implements in use among the French Canadians till after 1880 were of a kind abandoned in the United States and Ontario long before.⁷⁵

A select committee of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada made an inquiry into the agricultural condition of the French Canadians in 1850. From an analysis of the opinions offered by a number of prominent farmers and political and clerical leaders the committee was convinced that a prerequisite to the improvement of agricultural methods was the provision of instruction for the habitants. It made several recommendations, including two of some significance. One of these was that the Provincial Government should subsidize all agricultural societies, not as hitherto merely those which had raised money by subscription. The other was that the Government should make grants to the classical Catholic colleges of St. Hyacinthe, Nicolet, L'Assomption,

and Ste. Anne de la Pocatière to enable each of them to establish a chair of agriculture and operate a model farm.⁷⁶

The proposal to establish agricultural schools in Lower Canada was not new. An elementary agricultural school with a small model farm attached had been opened at Charlesbourg, near Quebec, in 1833. The pupils were few, and, on the failure of the Provincial Government to subsidize it, the school was closed in 1835.⁷⁷ In the late 1840s the trustees of the College of St. Hyacinthe had in mind the opening of a school of agriculture, partly because it was thought that it would be a useful means of utilizing some land belonging to the college.⁷⁸ Nothing further was done, however, to create a special school of agriculture till 1858. In that year the corporation of the College of Ste. Anne decided to establish in connection with the school a course in agriculture and to operate a model farm. It sent one of the members of the faculty to France to visit the imperial schools of agriculture and study their organization and methods of instruction. On his return the agricultural school accepted its first students.⁷⁹ The same year a new lecture course in agriculture was offered at the Jacques Cartier Normal School in Montreal, with visits being made to farms near the city.⁸⁰ In the summer of 1860 a course in agriculture was set up at the College of Varennes, but so few pupils registered that the project was virtually still-born.⁸¹ Another French-Canadian college, L'Assomption, offered a course similar to that at Ste. Anne beginning in 1867-68.⁸²

The deficiencies of these projects for agricultural education are evident from a description of the school at Ste. Anne. Till 1865 the course was almost entirely theoretical, for the school lacked

⁷³ *Farmer's Advocate* (London, Ontario), December 1875, 242.

⁷⁴ *Census of Canada 1870-1*, 3 (Ottawa).

⁷⁵ It was written of the Quebec region in 1880: "Tilling, sowing, reaping and storing are all done by hand. In the back parishes the rudest of home-made ploughs, dragged along by a couple of oxen, and a horse—who seems to move the oxen that they may move the plough, barely scratch up the soil. A French-Canadian harrow is the most primaeval of implements, being at best a rough wooden rake, and often merely a lot of brushwood fastened to a beam. The scythe and the sickle are not yet displaced by mowing machines; all the ingenious contrivances for harvesting, binding and storing, are unknown. Threshing is still done by flails and strong arms..." George Monro Grant, ed., *Picturesque Canada; The Country as It Was and Is*, 1:84 (Toronto, 1882).

⁷⁶ Canada, Legislative Assembly, *Journal*, 1850, appendix TT.

⁷⁷ *Revue Agricole*, juillet 1864, 296.

⁷⁸ Canada, Legislative Assembly, *Journal*, 1850, appendix TT.

⁷⁹ *L'Agriculteur*, janvier 1859, 99; *Revue Agricole*, avril 1867, 194.

⁸⁰ *L'Agriculteur*, janvier 1859, 99; *Revue Agricole*, février 1867, 135-136.

⁸¹ *L'Agriculteur*, juillet 1860, 245-246, juillet 1861, 242; *Revue Agricole*, octobre 1861, 2.

⁸² *Ibid.*, octobre 1867, 5, 7. At English-speaking McGill University in Montreal a course in agriculture, presumably entirely theoretical, was offered beginning in 1865. *Ibid.*, avril 1865, 227.

even models of improved implements; it had only a few mongrel Ayrshires, Berkshires, and Leicesters; and it made no effort to experiment with crops or breeding. In 1866 there were three teachers, one for agriculture, one for veterinary medicine, and one for rural law. The pupils had three hours a day of recitation and four hours of work in the workshop or the fields of the "model" farm. The curriculum included elementary mathematics, physics, chemistry, botany, simple accounting, rural law, and the general principles of field husbandry, gardening, livestock husbandry, and fruit growing. Though the Board of Agriculture of Lower Canada provided an annual scholarship for each of the twenty judicial districts, there were only eighteen students in attendance at the beginning of the term of 1866-67. All of them were teen-age boys who were intended to return to their fathers' farms on the completion of their course; there were no adults who might make instruction or experimentation their career.⁸³ A select committee of the Legislative Assembly in 1864 recognized that the training provided in the school was of exceedingly limited value and recommended that agricultural education of university level should be subsidized by the provincial administration.⁸⁴ The proposal was lost sight of in the political turmoil which preceded the federation of the British North American provinces, but in its first session the legislature of the Province of Quebec made an initial grant of \$14,000 for agricultural instruction, most of which seems to have been destined for building up the agricultural schools at Ste. Anne and L'Assomption.⁸⁵

The informal methods of agricultural education which the farmers in the United States and Upper Canada utilized remained foreign to the habitants. It will be recalled that the select committee of the Legislative Assembly in 1850 suggested that the work of the agricultural societies should be encouraged by governmental subsidies. At that time there were 34 agricultural societies in Lower Canada, only 5 of which had been in existence before 1845, when a system of provincial grants to match the subscriptions of members was inaugurated. As a result of continued governmental subvention by 1861 there were 71 societies, that is, one in each of 59 electoral divisions and 2 in each

of the other 6. In 1866 there were 73 societies. In Upper Canada, which had a population not greatly in excess of that of Lower Canada, there were then 63 electoral division societies, but in addition there were 252 township organizations.⁸⁶ Unfortunately most of the Lower Canada societies failed in their avowed purpose of improving agriculture by instruction and competition. Few of them were as successful as even the township societies in Upper Canada or the United States, and the provincial exhibitions in Lower Canada were in sorry contrast to the provincial exhibition of Upper Canada or the American state fairs.⁸⁷

In the Montreal region there were a few progressive agricultural societies. One of the best was a predominantly Scotch organization in Beauharnois County. It brought in improved livestock, especially horses, gave field crop prizes, imported the latest implements (including five reapers from the United States in 1867), had a plowing match, sponsored lectures, and subscribed for farm journals on behalf of its members.⁸⁸ Most of the societies elsewhere, including virtually all the French-Canadian, did little that was useful for the cause of agricultural improvement and much that was positively harmful to it.

No matter how weak a society might be, it always held an annual exhibition. The typical Lower Canada exhibition of the 1850s and 1860s consisted of a show of livestock, grain in bags, butter, maple sugar, and home manufactures, sometimes a plowing match, and usually a banquet in the afternoon or evening. There was no horse racing at all and evidently no sideshows, the only entertainment, if any was provided, being furnished by a brass band.⁸⁹ It was an advantage in some respects for the exhibitions not to be overwhelmed by horse racing and sideshows like many of their contemporaries in the Northern States but a disadvantage in so far as their absence meant a lack of appeal to spectators. Nor was this the only lack in the exhibition. Competition among the entrants for prizes was a farce, for the habitants felt that the function of the exhi-

⁸⁶ *Agricultural Journal*, May 1849, 158; *Revue Agricole*, octobre 1861, 29-32, janvier 1867, 101.

⁸⁷ Thus at the provincial exhibition at Sherbrooke in 1862 there were only 175 horses entered, 350 cattle, 75 sheep, and 40 pigs, and many of these animals were mongrels. *Ibid.*, octobre 1862, 5-6.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, mars 1868, 168.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, octobre 1861, 14-15, octobre 1862, 15-16, novembre 1865, 43.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, octobre 1865, 35, janvier 1867, 98-99, avril 1867, 195-198.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, juin 1864, 264.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, mars 1868, 167.

bition was merely to provide a means of sharing the government grant among the members of the agricultural society. It was the ordinary procedure to award to any competitor who did not win a prize an amount equal to, or even in excess of, his subscription to the funds of the society. The total of these consolation prizes or *gratifications* often equalled the money offered in premiums.⁹⁰ Another fairly general practice was little different in its effects than the giving of *gratifications*. Some of the societies had many little prizes instead of a few large ones. When a society awarded prizes of \$8, \$7, \$6, \$5, \$4, \$3, \$2, \$1, and 50 cents in one class those who won all but the highest amounts were in reality receiving consolation prizes.⁹¹

The same spirit prevailed in the other activities of the societies. Even when they were sufficiently interested in the acquisition of improved livestock to set apart some of their capital for the purpose, they often ignored the first principles of breeding by buying crossbred bulls.⁹² A more reprehensible practice was that of the Temiscouata and L'Islet societies which simply granted money to members to purchase "improved" livestock for themselves.⁹³ Not much better was the custom of the Montcalm County Agricultural Society of giving money for the importation of improved animals provided they won a prize (and which one did not?) at the next exhibition.⁹⁴ One of the worst abuses arose when the agricultural societies used part of their funds for purchasing clover seed. Originally encouraged as a method of building up the pastures of Lower Canada, it became during the late 1850s simply a means whereby the government through its matching grants furnished clover seed free to the members of the least progressive societies.⁹⁵

⁹⁰ *L'Agriculteur*, mai 1860, 195-196; *Revue Agricole*, septembre 1867, 362, novembre 1867, 40, juin 1868, 276.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, novembre 1862, 43, août 1864, 329, septembre 1867, 362, juin 1868, 276. Possibly under these circumstances it made little real difference that many complaints were made about the judges at the exhibitions. Sometimes they were said to be simply incapable but at other times they were alleged to be the devoted friends of some of the competitors. *Ibid.*, mars-avril 1863, 216, août 1864, 327.

⁹² *L'Agriculteur*, novembre 1859, 49-50.

⁹³ *Revue Agricole*, octobre 1867, 11, mars 1868, 169.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, avril 1868, 205.

⁹⁵ *L'Agriculteur*, mars 1860, 146; *Revue Agricole*, avril 1867, 359-360, avril 1868, 203-207, juin 1868, 273-275.

Wherever there was a mixed population, racial politics interfered with the success of the societies. Around Montreal and Quebec and in the parts of the Eastern Townships then being colonized by French Canadians it was customary to avoid clashes by having separate prize lists for the French-Canadian and the English-speaking competitors at the exhibitions. This was partly because the habitants with their recognized inferiority in livestock could not win any premiums otherwise, but it was also a device for avoiding friction.⁹⁶ Usually the antagonism between the two groups was covert, but on at least one occasion it flared openly. For many years the agricultural society in Chateauguay County had been dominated by the Scotch farmers. Then, in 1863, the French Canadians managed to fill the presidency and the board of directors, leaving the Scots only the office of vice president. No record is available as to the effect of the change on the fortunes of the society, but it may be assumed that it was not good, as the whole procedure was characterized by its reporter as a lesson in the value of union among his "oppressed compatriots."⁹⁷

The deficiencies of the agricultural societies were well recognized, but little was done to get rid of them. The Board of Agriculture of Lower Canada which nominally supervised the societies was a weak organization which seldom met.⁹⁸ It was not till March 1868 that it decided that the practices of giving *gratifications* at the exhibitions and of making racial distinctions in the prize lists should be suppressed, that no part of the annual government grant to a society should be used for the purchase of clover seed and not more than half of the funds subscribed by the members, and that at least 25 percent of the government grant should be spent for improved livestock.⁹⁹ The abuses struck at in this pronouncement were much too solidly rooted to be destroyed by good intentions.

The French Canadians gained even less agricultural education from their farm journals than from their agricultural societies. The farm

⁹⁶ Letter of William Boa of St. Laurent, July 12, 1850, in Canada, Legislative Assembly, *Journal*, 1850, appendix TT; *Revue Agricole*, octobre 1861, 14-15, 50-52, septembre 1867, 361.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, mars-avril 1863, 218-219.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, décembre 1867, 70.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, avril 1868, 197-198.

journals of Lower Canada were inferior to those of Upper Canada and the United States, but even if they had been superior the result would have been the same. In 1857 there were only 500 to 600 subscribers to *L'Agriculteur* and in 1865 only 3,000 to *La Revue Agricole*.¹⁰⁰ A generation after the period covered by this article it was regretfully acknowledged that the habitants who could read were violently prejudiced against agricultural periodicals, preferring to get their advice from their neighbors or the parish priest.¹⁰¹

In the period between mid-century and Canadian Confederation the Montreal region and the

Eastern Townships duplicated the economic progress of Upper Canada and the Northern States. This the French-Canadian portion of Lower Canada failed to do. Here it seemed impossible to overcome an agricultural stagnation so persistent that it was affirmed in 1865 that two-thirds of the habitants were getting more deeply into debt each year.¹⁰² It was not till after another decade that the expansion of dairying in Quebec brought a slowly growing prosperity among the French Canadians and with it a tendency towards better farm management.¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, avril 1865, 246.

¹⁰¹ Testard de Montigny, *La Colonisation: Le Nord de Montréal ou la Région Labelle*, 104-105 (Montreal, 1898).

¹⁰² *Revue Agricole*, mars 1865, 203.
¹⁰³ For a brief survey of the agricultural development of Quebec since 1867, see J. Adelard Godbout, "Agriculture in Quebec: Past—Present—Future," *Canadian Geographical Journal*, 28:163-180 (Montreal, 1944).

FINNISH OVERSEAS EMIGRATION FROM ARCTIC NORWAY AND RUSSIA

JOHN ILMARI KOLEHMAINEN

Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio

Hundreds of Finnish folk migrated from the Arctic shores of Norway and Russia to America during the years 1864-1885. The story of their epic search for land and a rural way of life began in Oulu, the northern province of Finland.

Life in the rural settlements scattered along the Tornio, Muonio, Kemi, and other rivers of the vast Kemi and Lapland districts of northern Oulu was incredibly hard. From the forests and streams came insufficient game; herds of cows and flocks of sheep were the infrequent badges of wealth; and agriculture faced formidably unfavorable climatic and soil conditions. A famous traveler found "many small and poor farms, where a large family has to work hard to get a living from the soil" around Matarenki; another observer noted numerous indigent colonists between Kolari and Muonionniska; and beyond the latter place the American Bayard Taylor found only "miserably poor" settlers. Kittilä was described by a Finnish philologist as the "original home of poverty and wretchedness." A fellow countryman encountered snowflakes in July at Kuorinka and concluded that "frost more frequently than the farmer reaped the harvest." Taylor likewise recorded that "Even in mid-summer the blighting frost may fall" and that "a single night may make his labours utterly profitless."

Nowhere in Finland was "food so scarce." The first words of every visitor were: "Onkos talossa leipää, emäntä?" (Is there bread in the house, matron?) Turnips, "bread, potatoes, salt-water, and buttermilk" constituted in normal years the Spartan diet of the colonists.¹ In famine years conditions became appalling. In the 1850s, for example, "straw bread" was widely eaten. An American traveling through Kolari in 1856 was given a supper of "a pitcher of cold milk, some bread made of ground barley straw, horribly hard and tough, and a lump of sour frozen butter"; the peasant's family dinner consisted of an "immense pot of sour milk, butter, broken bread, and straw meal."² The seven lean years of the following decade, culminating in

¹ Paul B. Du Chaillu, *The Land of the Midnight Sun*, 1:61 (New York, 1882); Joseph Acerbi, *Travels through Sweden, Finland, and Lapland*, 2:12-13 (London, 1802); Bayard Taylor, *Northern Travel*, 71, 161 (New York, 1871); G. W. Edlund, ed., *M. A. Castrén in elämä ja matkustukset*, 18-19, 31 (Helsinki, 1878); A. V. Ervasti, *Suomalaiset Jäämeren rannalla*, 8-9 (Oulu, 1884); J. V. Snellman, "Muutamia muistutelmia maasta ja kansasta Pohjanmaalla," *Valitut teokset*, 4:163 (Porvoo, 1899); Ragnar Numelin, *Some Aspects of the Geography of Finland*, 29 (Helsinki, 1935); and P. G. Minneman, "Finland's Agriculture," *Foreign Agriculture*, 4:150 (1940).

² Taylor, *Northern Travel*, 92-93.

the ghastly famine of 1867, loosened in many Finns the bonds that tied them to their native land. The unfortunate victims smote their breasts, shouting that God had forsaken Finland, and they were compelled to "scrape birch-bark and mix it with flour, or cook reindeer-moss with milk." Many were the settlers who threatened to abandon "this accursed place."³

"Sharing food with the squirrels" was not the only hardship. Many colonists complained of the interminable red tape in getting title to their holdings. If the onerous conditions were not promptly met, the "poor settlers along with their small children were driven from the humble cottages which they had just been able to erect."⁴ Small landowners grumbled about their tax burden while their sons and daughters lamented the lack of a promising future. The specter of insecurity most menacingly threatened, however, the numerous landless cottagers and backwoods squatters, hired hands, and servant girls.⁵ Moreover, a number of the Finns, deeply touched by the Laestadian Awakening of the fifties and sixties, found their countrymen unsympathetic with the new religious teachings. Underlying these grievances was the memory of the grim visitation in years past of war and desolation and military service; vividly many recalled the havoc of the war of 1808-09.⁶

These factors, playing upon a people descended from the ancient wandering *Kainulaiset* and *Pirkkalaiset* and in whose veins still throbbed a "mighty migratory spirit,"⁷ compelled many of them to

seek a Promised Land in *Ruija* (Finmark and East Tromsø) or *Ryssän-ranta* (Kola Lapland). As early as 1714 (1708?) a Finnish settlement appeared in Alten, but the real growth of the immigrant element in northern Norway came during the first three quarters of the nineteenth century.⁸ Their number increased from an estimated 780 in 1825 to 2,733 in 1845, reaching 4,596 in 1855 and 5,862 in 1865; the area of Finnish settlement spread from Alten, Lyngen, Nordreisen, Kvaenangen, and other communities in East Tromsø and West Finmark to Kiberg, Jakobselv, Salttjernet, Høvik, Skullnes, Naesseby, Ekkerøy, Vardø, and Vadsø, fishing towns along Finmark's bleak east coast. The immigrants, coming in large numbers during the famine years (205 Finns coming to Vadsø in 1866), were drawn largely from the Oulu settlements of Kittilä, Oulu, Utsjoki, Sodankylä, Muonionniska, Inari, Kemi, Alatornio, Karunki, Ylitornio, Turtola, Kolari, Tervola, Rovaniemi, Kemijärvi, Kuolajärvi, and Kuusamo. Still others were recruited from the ten thousand or so Finns (13,739 in 1860) living in Norbotten prov-

among other studies, A. Wærelius, "Bidrag till Finlands kändedom i ethnografiskt afseende," in *Suomi 1847*, 47-130 (Helsinki, 1848); U. T. Sirelius, *The Genealogy of the Finns* (Helsinki, 1925); and C. S. Coon, *The Races of Europe*, 355-360 (New York, 1939). K. J. Jalkanen, in "Amerikantauti" *Suomessa 16 ja 17 vuosisadalla* (Jyväskylä, 1896), shows the presence in Finland of a migratory tendency antedating emigration to America. On Finnish overseas emigration in general, see M. Tarkkanen, *Siirtolaisuudesta, sen syistä ja seurauksista* (Helsinki, 1903); O. K. Kilpi, "Suomen siirtolaisuudesta," *Oma Maa*, 5:694-708 (Porvoo, 1908); and John Ilmari Kolehmainen, "Finland's Agrarian Structure and Overseas Migration," *Agricultural History*, 15:44-48 (1941), and "Why We Came to America: the Finns," *Common Ground*, 5:77-79 (1944).

⁸ In addition to Skogman, "Suomalaiset Ruotsissa ja Norjassa," the standard Finnish works on the Norwegian Finns include: S. Paulaharju, *Ruijan Suomalaisia* (Helsinki, 1928), and *Ruijan äärimmäisillä saarilla* (Helsinki, 1935); A. V. Ervasti, *Suomalaiset Jäämeren rannalla* (Oulu, 1884); and Ernst Lampén, *Jäämeren hengessä* (Jyväskylä, 1921). Norwegian accounts include: J. A. Friis, *En sommer i Finmarken, Russisk Lapland og Nordkarelen* (Christiania, 1880); B. M. Keilhau, *Reise i Øst- og Vest-Finmarken* (Christiania, 1831); Hans Reusch, *Folk og natur i Finmarken* (Christiania, 1895); Sophus Tromholt, *Under nordlysets stråler: skildringer fra Lappernes land* (Copenhagen, 1885); N. V. Stockfleth, *Om Qvænerne i Norge*; and J. Qvigstad, *Den kvaenske indvandring til Nord-Norge*.

³ For moving descriptions of the famine years, see K. A. Tavaststjerna, *Kovina aikoina* (Porvoo, 1892); and Alkio, *Murtavia voimia* (Porvoo, 1896).

⁴ P. Laestadius, *Försättning af Journalen öfver missionsresor i Lappmarken*, 2:380 (Stockholm, 1833).

⁵ On wages of agricultural workers, see H. Paavilainen, *Maataloudesta ja toimenpiteistä sen kohottamiseksi*, 116-122 (Helsinki, 1913).

⁶ K. O. Lindeqvist, *Suomen historia*, 357-375 (Porvoo, 1906); for the eighteenth-century wars, see J. Gummerus, comp., *Muistelmia ison vihan ajoilta* (Jyväskylä, 1913).

⁷ The precise relationship of the ancient *Kainulaiset* and *Pirkkalaiset*, called *Kvaener* by the Norwegians, to the modern Finns has been a controversial question. For contrasting views, see D. Skogman, "Suomalaiset Ruotsissa ja Norjassa," in *Suomi 1869*, 129-166 (Helsinki, 1870); and Yrjö Koskinen, "Pohjanmaan asuttamisesta," in *Suomi 1857*, 111-150 (Helsinki, 1858), and his *Suomen kansan historia*, 12-14 (Helsinki, 1881). On the ethnography of the Finns, consult

ince on the Swedish side of the Tornio and Muonio rivers.⁹ The accompanying table indicates the number and distribution of the Finnish immigrants in Tromsø and Finnmark during the years 1845-1900.

On the other hand, Finnish settlement in Kola Lapland was far less numerous and more recent

Kuusamo, and Finnmark.¹⁰ Four years later nine Finnish families in all were reported living in the Russian Arctic holdings. By 1882, however, the number of Finns had increased to 678, distributed in the following settlements: Uura, 184; Pummanki, 183; Paatsjoki and Salmijärvi, 100; Kervana, 50; Vaitokupa, 40; Muotka, 40; Saani-

Finns in Northern Norway

	1845	1855	1865	1875	1900
<i>Senjen and Tromsø:</i>					
Ibestad.....	—	25	58	62	44
Maalselven.....	—	93	108	118	58
Balsfjorden.....	—	122	167	64	81
Karlsø.....	29	50	36	—	14
Lyngen.....	436	719	766	712	498
Skjervø.....	426	858	585	389	186
Kvaenangen.....	—	—	392	—	146
Nordreisen.....	159	367	—	—	491
<i>Alten:</i>					
Loppen.....	50	47	81	—	82
Talvik.....	} 863	} 1,058	111	155	113
Alten.....			708	716	554
Kautokeino.....	—	27	24	18	—
<i>Hammerfest:</i>					
Hammerfest (rural).....	118	—	178	21	17
Maasø.....	—	10	56	69	80
Kistrand.....	205	270	227	162	693
<i>Tanen:</i>					
Tanen & Naesseby.....	64	83	163	286	409
Lebesby.....	13	43	49	64	57
<i>Varanger:</i>					
Vardø (rural).....	—	—	36	78	226
Vadsø (rural).....	129	—	328	654	598
Sydvaranger.....	—	—	339	702	818
<i>Cities:</i>					
Tromsø.....	82	248	209	98	38
Hammerfest.....	154	356	318	309	124
Vardø.....	8	14	35	85	250
Vadsø.....	134	645	773	1,027	870
Total (including scattered settlements not listed)...	2,733	4,596	5,862	6,393	5,894

in character. The first colony was founded at Uura in 1860 by immigrants from Sodankylä,

vuono, 35; Kola (city), 20; Stolbova, 11; Lapinmutka, 10; and Petsamo, 5.

⁹ Skogman, "Suomalaiset Ruotsissa ja Norjassa," 168, 184; Ervasti, *Jäämeren rannalla*, 253-254; Paulaharju, *Ruijan Suomalaisia*, 229-230. The governor of Oulu reported that 162 of his inhabitants left for northern Norway during 1863-65, 54 being from Kittilä, 37 from Oulu, 25 from Utsjoki, 20 from Sodankylä, 18 from Muonionniska, and 8 from Inari.

¹⁰ On Finnish settlement in the Russian Arctic areas, see Ervasti, *Jäämeren rannalla*, 43-178; Theodor Homén, *Itä-Karjala ja Kuollan Lappi*, 3-77 (Helsinki, 1918); A. P. Engelhardt, *A Russian Province of the North*, 150-164 (Westminster, 1899); T. Pohjankankervo, "Suomalaisasutuksen vaiheista Jäämeren rannalla," *Veljeysviesti*, 20:19-20 (Astoria, Oreg., 1943).

In 1897, the Finnish immigrants constituted 12 percent (1,056) of the total population of the Aleksandrovska district; two years later a census revealed 209 immigrant households in Kola Lapland, 139 of which were situated in West Murmansk, 44 in Kolafjord, 25 in the Paats River area, and 1 in East Murmansk.

It was the inexhaustible plentitude of fish in the "wonderfully clear green water" of the Arctic Ocean that attracted a majority of the Finnish rural folk northward. The road to the fishing villages of Finmark, Tromsø, and Kola Lapland was long, difficult, and dangerous. Starting from their homes usually in late February in order to reach the fishing grounds before the commencement of the spring run of cod around March 25, the emigrants traveled on foot or skis or sleighs in groups of 20 to 30, including young and old of both sexes. The weariness of the more affluent, those wearing "silken shawls and fine clothes," was considerably ameliorated by hired horses and "camels of the North."¹¹ The journey to the polar coast, a distance ranging from 400 to 800 kilometers, took from 19 to 35 days; expenditures for some wayfarers rose to 250 Finnish marks. The trek, formidable under the most favorable conditions, was made more onerous by the growing reluctance of the Lapps to give assistance, the lack of adequate food and shelter, and the contingencies of Arctic travel.

Three main routes led from Finland to the shores of the northern sea. The first followed the Tornio and Muonio rivers to Muonionniska where it forked: the right branch went through Kautokeino to the Alten and Tana rivers; the left branch proceeded to Kaaressuvanto and thence to the Lyngen and Tromsø regions. The central route ran northward from Kemi to Rovaniemi, Kittilä, and thence to the Ivalo River and down the Paats River to Neiden and Vadsø. This route was joined at the Ivalo River by branches coming up from Sodankylä, Kemijärvi, and Kuolajärvi. The eastern road leading to *Ryssän-ranta* started

from the Kuusamo and Kuolajärvi districts, crossed into Russian Kantalahti, and followed the Kola River to Kola and Aleksandrovska.

Upon reaching the seacoast, the immigrants undertook the new and strange and difficult work of deep-sea Arctic fishing. The burdens of the new way of life were many. To begin with, the northern Finlanders were a rural and land-centered rather than a seagoing people. They had, as one writer has convincingly showed, no innate love for the ocean.¹² Many, to be sure, successfully made the transition and became able and courageous fishermen and whalers. As a Norwegian observed, "They come from far-off Finland's forests, they have never seen the ocean, yet unafraid they step into their small fishing vessels."¹³ To these immigrants the sea became in a real sense "their gardens." Yet numerous were the Finns who in time rebelled against the overwhelmingly odorous and monotonous way of life, one whose alpha and omega were: "Live fish, dead fish, dried fish, cured fish, fish-heads, fish-entrails, smell of fish, stink of fish, vessels which bring fish, and vessels which fetch fish, people who buy fish, and people who sell fish, people who only live for fish, people who only live on fish, only speak, think, and dream of fish—nothing else."¹⁴

Fishing was not child's play although young boys and girls as well as mothers were compelled to join in the back-breaking jobs of baiting the long multihooked lines, cleaning fish, and hanging them to dry in endless racks. Raw and icy winds and corrosive salt air soon coated the toilers with the unmistakably rough and weather-beaten exterior of a seafaring people. In the early days of small and undependable craft, fishing was also dangerous. The Arctic Ocean had won for itself a deservedly fearful reputation for sudden and violent storms, when both angry sea and rocky havenless shores conspired against the hapless fishermen. The storm of 1875 shocked the Finns. It came suddenly; the sailors in

¹² Snellman, *Valitut teokset*, 4:164.

¹¹ Frank Vincent, *Norsk, Lapp, and Finn*, 160 (New York, 1881). Travel by deer was not as swift as many assumed. Sophus Tromholt, *Under the Rays of the Aurora Borealis*, 2:148 (Boston, 1885), suggested that under certain conditions "a clumsy bullock would distance the reindeer." On the deer in northern life, see Ilmari Kianto, *Poro-kirja* (Helsinki, 1913). The difficulties of travel to the Arctic coast are well portrayed in Acerbi, *Travels*, 1:324-332, and Taylor, *Northern Travel*, 110-125.

¹³ Eilert Sundt quoted in Paulaharju, *Ruian Suomalaisia*, 508. For tales about the immigrants' experiences as fisherfolk, see S. Paulaharju, *Tunturien yö-puolta. Vanhoja tarinoita* (Helsinki, 1934).

¹⁴ Tromholt, *Under the Rays of the Aurora Borealis*, 2:270. Paulaharju related the "fears" of many Finns that they would be transformed into fish themselves. According to Lampén, the immigrants, and especially the children, had a hearty dislike for the cod as a fish.

their eagerness to lift a rich harvest had not noted the restless flight of their faithful companions, the birds—the sign of danger. Quickly “all the sea and sky were but a single vast sheet of water and snow”; Judgment Day rode the waves. In the Vardø district alone, a hundred names were added to the rolls of the unhappy sea spirits haunting the deep polar graveyards. There were no old men in Vardø was the comment of one observer; “few of the poor fishermen end their days in bed.”¹⁵

There were in addition serious man-made difficulties. The industry was largely controlled by merchant houses to whom the fishermen under the prevailing truck and barter system “sold the fish before they were caught.” Easy credit, especially in Norway, enmeshed many gullible as well as needy Finns; in 1866, for example, the names of 222 immigrants were listed in the “big book” of a Vadsø merchant. Often enough in Kola Lapland as in Finmark, the fishermen ended a hard and laborious season still indebted to the merchants. Of great concern to the Finns was the growing statutory discrimination against alien fishermen. Not all of the emigrants going to the fishing settlements intended to reside permanently in the Arctic regions. A large number were transient workers, “birds of passage,” who came to the polar sea, like the Lapps since time immemorial, to fish during the spring season and then return to their homes after the run of cod was over. The Norwegian statutes of the late sixties and seventies, for example, attempted to protect the interests of the permanent residents and citizens from invasion by these migratory fishermen. Under their provisions free fishing rights were taken away from the aliens; they could only hire themselves out to merchants or fish on a share basis in a vessel owned and piloted by a Norse citizen; a special fishing fee was likewise exacted.¹⁶

¹⁵ Edward Rae, *The White Sea Peninsula*, 7 (London, 1881).

¹⁶ R. G. Latham, *Norway and the Norwegians*, 2:192–193 (London, 1840); Vincent, *Norsk, Lapp, and Finn*, 60–61; Paulaharju, *Ruijan Suomalaisia*, 316–318; Engelhardt, *A Russian Province*, 126; Friis, *En sommer*, 86. According to Ervasti, *Jäämeren rannalla*, 247, there were large numbers of transient fishermen coming annually to the Arctic to fish. Out of a total of 16,429 fishermen in Finmark in 1878, more than 10,000 were not residents of the province. The Finns constituted about one-eleventh of all the fishermen in Norway

Moreover the usual pecuniary rewards of fishing were hardly commensurate with its hardships. Whether working as hired seamen or fishing on shares under the so-called sweat system, a majority of the Finnish fishermen reaped a pitifully small financial harvest.¹⁷ Fond hopes were frequently shattered by bad seasons. In some years the catch of cod was disappointingly small; equally disastrous was the failure, as in 1876, of the bait fish (*Mallotus villosus*) to appear. Truly, the lot of the Arctic fisherman's family was an unhappy and unfortunate one; poverty and privation were the recompense for a “constant, never-ceasing battle with the severe and inhospitable elements of nature.” As if to make life even more impossible, there was a great deal of illness among the fisherfolk, at least in the early years. Respiratory diseases, stemming from the moist climate and damp overcrowded dwellings, were frequent; scurvy, too, was a common consequence of a singularly unbalanced diet. Yet “not even an apothecary's assistant” could be “found on these thirteen hundred miles of coast between Vardø and Archangel.”¹⁸

The adversities of a fisherman's life were only heightened by the grim climate and repellent landscape which dominated Finmark's east coast and the shores of Kola Lapland. Bleak desolate mountains and precipitous cliffs against which ceaselessly pounded a mysterious polar ocean whose outer limits the eye could not see. There was not a patch of green grass or a row of shrubbery or a clump of trees. The towns of the east coast seemed to epitomize the unfriendliness of nature: Hammerfest's “dreary, desolate landscape”; Vardø, buffeted by raw winds rising from the “Siberian tundra and the ice-choked Kara sea”; Vadsø, whose winters were “long and dark and stormy” and whose only “summer perfume” was that of dried cod. Along the Murmansk coast the climate was equally “bleak and raw.” “All

and Russia. On the Lappish movement to the Arctic, see K. B. Wiklund, *Die Wanderungen der nomadisierenden schwedischen Lappen nach Norwegen in älterer und neuerer Zeit* (Upsala, 1908).

¹⁷ Paulaharju estimated the net savings under the share system to be from 400 to 500 crowns per season; Ervasti suggested that immigrants working for wages earned only from 75 to 150 crowns.

¹⁸ Rae, *White Sea Peninsula*, 88. See also Engelhardt, *A Russian Province*, 124; Paulaharju, *Ruijan Suomalaisia*, 352; Homén, *Kuollan Lappi*, 72.

winds are cold on this coast", was the judgment of an English traveler. "The north wind comes from the polar ice: the east wind from the Kara Sea, Siberia, and the Oüräl: the south from the White sea, the half-frozen lakes and the *tándras*: the west from the snow-covered fjelds of Norway."¹⁹ Surely, commented many immigrants, East Finmark and Kola Lapland were not the manifestation of God's love for man, if for bird and fish; they were as Ochter had found them in the late ninth century, a dreadful fog-bound "wilderness and desert country."²⁰ Finnish landscape in retrospect seemed to take on richer meaning. Many immigrants recalled, for the first time perhaps, the beauties of their birthplace: a wintry Hattá under a "lovely azure sky, the play of the sun on the white glistening fields, the gay chirping of the birds from the fir-boughs draped in hoar-frost"; a Kyrö district in the summer, "one vast fir-forest, dotted with lakes, rivers, and marshes. . . the rays of the noonday sun playing in the verdant crowns."²¹ But along the Arctic Ocean nature was so ugly and brutal that the "cocks stop their crowing, the horses their neighing." No doubt the American traveler expressed the thoughts of many immigrants when he wrote: "These people surely deserve to enter Paradise when they die, for they live in hell while upon earth." Ages earlier the Siberian Samoyeds had reached the same conclusion; their Kingdom of Death was upon the earth, and heaven lay below.²²

The real love of many Finnish immigrants was, in truth, revealed in their constant and courageous efforts to practice agriculture along with fishing. To be sure, conditions in Finmark and Kola Lapland were even less promising than in Finland's Kemi and Lapland districts: a rocky peaty soil; polar climatic conditions with sudden frosts,

crippling cold winds, and short growing seasons; absence of pasturage and hay fields for cattle and sheep. Vardø's annual mean temperature in the seventies, for example, was only a fraction of a degree above freezing; the average yearly range in Hammerfest was from 22 to 53 degrees. In 1856 in Vadsø "the snow had been four feet deep in the streets in the beginning of June, and in six weeks it would begin to fall again"; likewise in Vardø snow in July was not a rarity. In many Finmark settlements, as in Kistrand, "neither gardens, fields nor potato patches" seemed possible. Similarly, agriculture in Kola Lapland, as the governor of Archangel reported, was "a perpetual struggle against nature," largely "foredoomed to failure." Bleak springs retarded sowing until the fifteenth of June if not later; early August frosts robbed the fishermen-farmers of the fruits of their toil; the soil, where it was suited for primitive agriculture, required a great deal of manuring. Pasturage for livestock was hard to find; the problem of their fodder, especially during the long winter months, was critical. Frequently enough, to the amazement of an American, a radical solution was found: "A few forlorn cows were hunting pasture over the hills, now and then looking with melancholy resignation at the strings of codfish hanging up to dry, on the broth of which they are fed during the winter."²³ Finmark and Kola Lapland much more than Tromsø fit the words of the poet, Peter Daas:

I Tromsen har ingen Mand Plog eller Harv
Dem levnes ej Såd eller Ager til Arv
Man Jorden i Furer ej velter.
I Dybet herunder de søger sit Brød,
Og naar det mislinger, da lider de Nød,
Og megen stor Armod forsmelter.²⁴

Yet the ancient agricultural heritage of the Finns impelled them to try to surmount the rigors of the Arctic region. Parcels of land here

¹⁹ Taylor, *Northern Travel*, 314. On the difficulties confronting agriculture in Finmark and Kola Lapland, see also Du Chaillu, *Land of the Midnight Sun*, 2:135-145, 156, 160; Paulaharju, *Ruijan Suomalaisia*, 262-264; Engelhardt, *A Russian Province*, 44, 82; Homén, *Kuollan Lappi*, 50-51; Cutcliffe Hyne, *Through Arctic Lapland*, 9 (London, 1898).

²⁰ Quoted in Paulaharju, *Ruijan Suomalaisia*, 69. An approximate translation would be: "In Tromsø is neither plow nor harrow, no inheritance of harvest or garden, land cannot be plowed in furrow. From the deep they seek their bread, when fortune betrays, they suffer from need, and live in great poverty."²¹

¹⁹ Rae, *White Sea Peninsula*, 87; the other descriptions have been culled from a number of sources including Du Chaillu, Taylor, Tromholt, and Paulaharju.

²⁰ Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques, and Discoveries of the English Nation*, 1:52 (Edinburgh, 1884).

²¹ The descriptions of Hattá and Kyrö are from Tromholt, *Under the Rays of the Aurora Borealis*, 2:98, 156. Paulaharju, *Ruijan Suomalaisia*, 532-533, records the immigrants' colorful memories of Finland's "forested countryside . . . its wild berries along quiet rural roads . . . its beauty unsurpassed."

²² Paulaharju, *Ruijan Suomalaisia*, 179; Taylor, *Northern Travel*, 311; *Castrén'in matkustukset*, 109.

and there were laboriously broken into garden plots with plow and harrow frequently carried from Finland; seed, too, came from the Old Country for the first plantings of potatoes, turnips, radishes, barley, and rye. At first only scattered "kitchen gardens" appeared with "a few courageous radishes and some fool-hardy potatoes." By 1860, however, 60 barrels of potatoes were sowed in and around Vadsø, largely by Finnish immigrants; in the seventies, Finland was growing over 30,000 bushels annually. Potato production in West Murmansk reached nearly 50 tons in 1894. Livestock, moreover, was seen more frequently along side of the ubiquitous reindeer. The immigrant contribution to Finland's total of over 9,000 cattle, 20,000 sheep, and 400 pigs was important; of the 70 cows competing in a Vadsø show in 1877, a majority of the prize winners was Finnish-owned. In West Murmansk the number of cattle in 1899 was placed at 580 and the sheep at 1,082. Fifteen or so years earlier, the Finnish settlers in Pummanki had 45 cows, 47 sheep, 2 bulls, and 2 calves; at the smaller settlement at Muotka there were 13 cows, 5 sheep, 5 calves, and 2 bulls.²⁵ The pioneering rôle of the Finns in the Arctic region was generally recognized. A Norwegian asserted: "In agriculture the Finns are the pioneers of Finland. They have led the way and demonstrated that the land can be successfully cultivated."²⁶ A Scandinavian scientist likewise praised the immigrants; they were, in his opinion, "the best agriculturists in Finmarken."²⁷

At best the life of a Finland farmer was a "very anxious one." Agriculture seemed doomed to remain laborious, stunted, financially non-remunerative, and forever at the mercy of an unpredictable and uncontrollable nature. Never would it alone provide a living for its followers; "without the ocean and its fish, the people would perish."²⁸ To these land-loving, rural-minded

fishermen of East Finland and Kola Lapland as well as to immigrants practicing agriculture under more promising, yet difficult, conditions in East Tromsø and West Finland,²⁹ came wonderful news: free land in the New World! Reports from Norwegian sources were almost unbelievable: 160 acres of land easily cleared into vast productive fields; opportunity to earn "a barrel of American dollars" in mines and factories and railroads with which to start farming operations; a landscape and climate that verily rivaled those of inimitable Finland. The summons was irresistible. In 1864 three small groups, two of Vadsø Finns and one of Hammerfest Finns, left northern Norway for St. Peter and Red Wing, Minnesota; among their number were Peter Lahti, Matti Niemi, Antti Rovainen, Elias Peltoperä, and Matti Tiiperi.³⁰ In the following year, three Vadsø Finns, Matias Kärjenaho, Johan Wiinikka, and Olli Westerberg, left with the specific object of investigating the much bruited agricultural prospects in the Midwestern States; they likewise went to Minnesota, found a site to their liking, and laid the foundations for the celebrated Cokato settlement. Throughout the sixties and seventies and early eighties, fishermen and farmers abandoned their hard Arctic life without great regret. Over a hundred Vadsø Finns, for example, were said to have been aboard two emigrant vessels in 1871; two years later 200 Norwegian Finns were reported waiting passage at Liverpool. In a

and obliteration." Tromholt also suggested that "The nervous *rerum* of the town [Vardø] is like every other in Finland—fish." See also Alex. W. M. Clark Kennedy, *To the Arctic Regions and Back in Six Weeks*, 222 (London, 1878).

²⁹ Conditions in East Tromsø and West Finland were more favorable to agriculture. On Finnish rural activity in these areas, see Paulaharju, *Ruijan Suomalaisia*, 30 (Lyngen), 54 (Nordreisen), 68-70 (Alten), 101 (Kaafjord). As early as 1715, the Norse newspapers commented upon the successful immigrant cultivation of barley around Alten; by 1860 the area was harvesting over 1,000 barrels. In the opinion of one of Finland's governors, the Finns "clear and cultivate their land especially well, keep horses, cows, and small stock, and grow gardens where conditions permit." The immigrant women were praised for their skill in spinning, weaving, and making their own clothes and shoes.

³⁰ Ilmonen, *Amerikan Suomalaisen Historia*, 2:25-27 (Jyväskylä 1923). See also John Ilmari Kolehmainen, "The Finnish Pioneers of Minnesota," *Minnesota History*, 25:317-328 (St. Paul, 1944).

²⁵ The statistical data are from Du Chaillu, *Land of the Midnight Sun*, 2:145; Homén, *Kuollan Lappi*, 50-51; Engelhardt, *A Russian Province*, 331; Ervasti, *Jämeren rannalla*, 113-116; Paulaharju, *Ruijan Suomalaisia*, 272, 470.

²⁶ Bjarne Hofseth, quoted in Paulaharju, *Ruijan Suomalaisia*, 263.

²⁷ Tromholt, *Under the Rays of the Aurora Borealis*, 2:216.

²⁸ Paulaharju, *Ruijan Suomalaisia*, 275. Cutcliffe Hyne, *Through Arctic Lapland*, 18, observed that "Nothing but fish stands between their town (Vardø)

single year, 1882, not less than one-twelfth of all the Finns in Kola Lapland (numbering some 60 to 70) set sail for the New World; they included 34 from Pummanki, 10 from Vaitokupa, and an equal number from Uura.³¹ Already by 1879 there were over 450 Finns in the Cokato country of Minnesota, most of whom had come from the Arctic coast of Norway and Russia. Other immigrant rural communities arose in the Dakotas, Oregon, Washington, and Michigan's Upper Peninsula.

There were, moreover, powerful religious forces compelling the Finns to turn their eyes toward rural America. Most of the Norwegian and Kola Lapland Finns were devout and faithful followers of Provost Lars Levi Laestadius (1800–61).³² The "fire and brimstone" teachings of this Swedish-born preacher and lawgiver to Lapps and Finns alike stressed, among other things, the reality of final judgment and the necessity of living in accordance with a stern religious law; the return to apostolic, non-institutionalized Christianity; the baptism of the spirit; the propriety and value of outward manifestation of inward emotions—crying and sighing and fainting in sorrow over sin, laughing and jumping and dancing over the joy of redemption; and, more mundanely, the forceful denunciation of deer thievery, drunkenness, and worldly urban pleasures. Puritanical, stern, often seemingly uncouth and rough, the Laestadian movement, notwithstanding, spread like "heather fire," as one Lapp recalled,³³ to the Lapland regions of Sweden, Norway, Russia, and Finland.

The strange and sometimes fanatical movement was not welcomed. In Finland widespread ridicule, and less frequently punishment, were the fate of the Awakened. In 1852, at Kittilä, for example, three Laestadian followers were fined twelve silver roubles, committed to eight days of "bread and water imprisonment," and compelled

to make public recantation of their allegedly heretical behavior. The reception given Laestadianism in Norway was not much more cordial; Norse Lutherans were as critical of this "religious malady" as their Finnish brethren. Perhaps typical was the disapprobation of the scientist who spoke of the "meeting-houses, in which the Kvaens exercise their riotous and licentious Laestadian worship."³⁴ Denunciation of the movement swelled after the "fearful and frightening" Kautokeino affair of 1852 when a group of Laestadian Lapps in a moment of religious frenzy murdered two residents of the settlement and threatened the lives of several others. Despite the vigorous defense of Laestadius in denying any legal or moral responsibility for the tragedy, many people in Norway and Finland and Russia, among them Bishops Juel and Johansson, held him accountable. More than that, many failed to see or accept any distinction between the "correct" beliefs of the Finnish Laestadians and the "wild spirit" typified by the Kautokeino Lapps. As a consequence, the immigrants sensed more vividly the tense atmosphere of recriminations of heresy, religious fanaticism, and violence.

Many other aspects of Arctic life worried the followers of Laestadius. There was widespread drunkenness in the fishing towns, stemming from the proverbial Arctic propensity toward drink and the ease with which intoxicating beverages could be obtained; gambling, dancing, and riotous living also caught their critical attention. Many immigrants reread in the sanctity of their dwellings the teachings of their master who had denounced the degeneracy of town life and had portrayed the hideousness of liquor, the "devil's dragon." They recalled his powerful insistence that goodness and blessedness and faith could only be attained in a rural life; his reiteration that the elect were the humble, plainly garbed, unsophisticated peasants and tillers of the soil.³⁵

A rural way of life and religious toleration—these were the two inner longings of many Laestadian Finns. Both, they came to know, could be found

³¹ Ervasti, *Jäämeren rannalla*, 105–106; Pohjan-kanervo, "Suomalaisasutuksen vaiheista Jäämeren rannalla," 19–20; Ilmonen, *Amerikan Suomalaisen historia*, 2:27.

³² A recent and sympathetic biography is Kaarlo Castrén, *Kiveliön suuri herättäjä, Lars Levi Laestadius dämäkerta* (Helsinki, 1932); it has an excellent bibliography. See also Gustaf Johansson, *Laestadiolaisuus* (Kuopio, 1892); E. Bergroth, *Suomen kirkko*, 2:857 (Porvoo, 1903).

³³ Johan Turi, *Turi's Book of Lapland*, 75 (London, 1910).

³⁴ Tromholt, *Under the Rays of the Aurora Borealis*, 2:242; Hans Reusch, *Folk og natur i Finmark*, 22–25; Johansson, *Laestadiolaisuus*, 180. For a highly sympathetic description of a Laestadian religious service, see Paulaharju, *Äärimmäisillä saarilla*, 129–135.

³⁵ The physiocratic leanings of Laestadius are clearly evident in his thesis, *Crapula Mundi* (1843), published in full in Castrén, *Laestadius*, 236–258.

in America. Thus it happened that large numbers of Laestadian preachers and followers crossed the Atlantic Ocean, bringing with them the beloved sermons and postils of their saint. In 1873 the immigrant Laestadians started their own congregation at Calumet, Michigan; other groups soon appeared elsewhere in Michigan, Minnesota, and neighboring States. By 1906 the Laestadian movement in America counted 68 churches with a communicant body of over 8,000.³⁶

There were, in addition, other forces impelling emigration to the New World. The Finnish settlers in Kola Lapland had many grievances. The imperial laws of 1868 and 1876, designed to encourage colonization in the area, had from the Finnish viewpoint serious deficiencies with regard to education, religion, fishing rights, and landownership.³⁷ As late as the 1890s, for example, the immigrants complained to the governor of Archangel that there was not a single school in the region, not even a Russian one! The czarist government, too, was becoming more and more dubious about the wisdom of colonizing the Arctic coast with Finnish-speaking settlers.

In Norway relations between the native-born citizens and immigrants were not always harmonious.³⁸ The Finns, on their part, complained of growing economic, religious, and linguistic discrimination. In the sixties and seventies, there prevailed, especially in East Finmark, an unfortunate situation marked by mutual suspicion and name-calling. Then, too, the cessation of operations at the Kaafjord mines threw hundreds of immigrants out of work; agents of the copper mines in far-away Michigan found them eager and willing listeners to their "glowing accounts of the good pay" available in that State.³⁹

³⁶ V. Rautanen, *Amerikan Suomalainen kirkko*, 13-33 (Hancock, Mich., 1911); E. Bergroth, *Eriuskolaistemme*, 23 (Kuopio, 1898); Johansson, *Laestadiolaisuus*, 197; Ilmonen, *Amerikan Suomalaisen historia*, 2:75-77; U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1936*, 2(2): 969 (Washington, 1941). The movement in America as abroad has remained preeminently rural in character.

³⁷ The colonization laws are summarized in Engelhardt, *A Russian Province*, 116-119; Homén, *Kuollan Lappi*, 36-38; Ervasti, *Jäämeren rannalla*, 97-106.

³⁸ Norse-Finnish relations are examined in greater detail in John Ilmari Kolehmainen, "Finnish Emigration from Norway to America," to be published in the Norwegian-American Historical Association, *Studies and Records* (Northfield, Minn.).

³⁹ Du Chaillu, *Land of the Midnight Sun*, 1:95-96; Tromholt, *Under the Rays of the Aurora Borealis*,

The Finnish miners, too, had responded to the urge of agriculture. Gardens distinguished their settlement in Kaafjord north of the copper works. In the New World the progression of many an immigrant was from mine hand to independent farmer.

The precise number of Finnish fishermen, farmers, and miners leaving Arctic Norway and Russia during 1864-85 cannot be established. Studies made of the pioneer Finnish settlers in Michigan and Minnesota suggest that perhaps 30 to 34 percent came from northern Norway and a very much smaller number from Russia; among them, of course, were many children born in the immigrant settlements outside of Finland. Perhaps not less than 750 and not more than 1,000 Finns in all took the circuitous route from Finland to Norway and Russia to America. An accurate estimate is made more difficult by two factors: the frequent movement of immigrants from Kola Lapland to Finmark and vice versa; the growing practice of the northern Oulu and Vaasa Finns to emigrate to northern Norway in order to take passage there for the New World. In 1866, for example, a Rovaniemi correspondent wrote to the Oulu *Wiikko Sanomat*: "Large droves of people are passing here on their way to Finmark, many of them are reported going to America to seek their fortune."⁴⁰ In a like manner a traveler commented: "A strong tide has begun to set towards the United States, the people coming from Finland in sleighs, and starting for America in the spring. Several hundred had left by way of Vadsö the year before, the steamers taking them either to Trondhjem, Bergen, or Christiania."⁴¹ By the middle eighties, however, as the America Fever swept southward into the central regions of Finland, more and more emigrants took new and easier routes from Finnish ports to the United States via England. After 1890, only a few Finns trickled into northern Norway either to settle or set sail for America.

Such, then, was the story of the coming of Finnish folk who had sought but not found a Promised Land in Arctic Norway and Russia. For them, as for so many other Europeans, the search for tillable land and a rural way of life, religious toleration and freedom, ended in America.

2:229; Charles Loring Brace, *The Norse-Folk*, 503 (New York, 1859); Theodore C. Blegen, *Norwegian Migration to America: The American Transition*, 415-417 (Northfield, Minn. 1940).

⁴⁰ Skogman, "Suomalaiset Ruotsissa ja Norjassa," 184.

⁴¹ Du Chaillu, *Land of the Midnight Sun*, 2:159.

GODKIN LOOKS AT WESTERN AGRARIANISM: A CASE STUDY

WILLIAM A. RUSS, JR.

Department of History and Political Science, Susquehanna University

Edwin Lawrence Godkin (1831-1902) was born in Ireland of English stock on both sides of his family. After receiving an excellent education, he did some newspaper work until 1856 when he arrived in the United States. He tried the law as a profession, but preferring journalism he launched the *Nation* on July 6, 1865. "From its very beginnings the *Nation* commended itself by its range of scholarship, breadth of view, and high moral tone, and it became, according to James Bryce, 'the best weekly not only in America but in the world.' " It had an influence out of all proportion to its circulation. When, in 1881, Godkin became associated in an editorial capacity with the *New York Evening Post*, he made the *Nation* the weekly edition of the *Post*. Godkin's pen came to be recognized as "a power in the State." His close associates were men like James Bryce, Charles Eliot Norton, James Russell Lowell, William and Henry James, Horace White, and Carl Schurz.¹

Godkin belonged to that coterie of able, highly intelligent, reformist elite, who, after the Civil War, were usually in the forefront of all movements for lower tariff, better government, and public integrity. As an independent Republican, he fought against spoils and the high tariff. As an editor, he strove to raise the standards of literary criticism. The highly intellectual quality of his editorials in the *Nation* and in the *Post* bespoke the keenness of his mind, but he was no secluded student. Fearlessly he attacked the evils which prevailed during his time. In short, if, as Bryce said, Godkin edited the best weekly in America, he had also one of the best minds in America. So level-headed and so independent was his comment upon topics of the times that historians have been wont to depend upon the editorials in the *Nation* in order to arrive at a sane interpretation of events. It is safe to say that few scholarly books have been written on the period after the Civil War without liberal quotation from Godkin's editorials.

In view of his reputation for independency,

¹ This paragraph is based on Rolo Ogden's biography of Godkin in the *Dictionary of American Biography*, 7:347-350 (New York, 1931).

honesty, and sanity, it is perhaps time to investigate Godkin's reactions to the farm movement which began in the late eighties as the Farmers' Alliance and which became Populism in the early nineties. No doubt Godkin is a safe guide for other events and topics. It is the thesis of this article, however, that historians are not justified in leaning upon him as their Baedeker through the thorny pathways of the Alliance and Populism.

When uncertain and conflicting news of western discontent began to filter eastward in the late eighties, the *Nation*, like many journals, was somewhat perplexed at the meaning of the commotion; as a consequence, its first editorials were restrained and cautious. During 1888 and 1889 it had scarcely half a dozen short notices in its columns about the Alliances, and these paragraphs were more questioning than denunciatory. Some of the earliest comments were even favorable; thus, on January 19, 1888, the editor mentioned an anti-tariff memorial which had been sent to Congress by the Nebraska State Farmers' Alliance.² As one of Godkin's chief articles of faith was tariff reform, this was cheering news. On May 16, 1889, the *Nation* really began to study the movement in order to find out what it meant. In that issue Godkin dissected the Alliance program by a process of analyzing the *National Economist* of Washington, which was the organ of the National Farmer's Alliance and Cooperative Union of America, the National Agricultural Wheel, and the Farmers' and Laborers' Union of America. The editor's conclusion was that "This is a formidable organization. . . ."³ It was in this article that Godkin first took a satirical and calculating attitude toward the farm movement.

In the winter of 1889-90 the *Nation* began to notice the various monetary schemes that were appearing in Congress. They were severely ridiculed. Thus, on March 6, 1890, Godkin said that a silver bill which had been offered by Senator J. P. Jones of Nevada was "as interesting as anything in Darwin's 'Variation of Animals and Plants under

² *Nation*, 46:42 (Jan. 19, 1888).

³ *Ibid.*, 48:396 (May 16, 1889).

Domestication.'"⁴ His comment was especially wrathful at a scheme of Senator Leland Stanford of California to lend government money at 2 percent "on mortgage" to farmers. This idea, said Godkin, was one of those "simmering in the heads of our public men, all tending to upset the laws of trade and the relations of *meum* and *tuum*," and he suggested with disgust that all these panaceas should be "consolidated in one comprehensive measure making every man's check legal tender up to a certain fair amount, to be determined by a committee in each Congressional district."⁵

Increasing silver agitation in Congress led Godkin to write a scathing essay on April 3, 1890 which summed up all the criticism he had been giving piecemeal. "Every few years", he asserted, "there comes to the surface of things agricultural an organization of one kind or another that proposes to amend the world in the interest of the farmer." Offices are opened, secretaries hired, stationery secured, and then perhaps "mischievous legislation is adopted which puts the farmer in a worse position than he was before by enabling smart people to rob him to better advantage." When the farmer sees he has been fooled again, the organization falls apart, the farmer digs into work once more and forgets his troubles until radicals start more commotion with new schemes to bring new disaster.⁶

By July 31, 1890, however, Godkin had sensed the fact that the farm movement would have considerable influence in the autumn elections. Nevertheless, he declared it was "simply impossible" that the Alliance could ever achieve any permanent existence or accomplish its aims. He denounced the political creed of the Alliance as entirely radical and destructive, and he characterized as childish the subtreasury plan whereby the Government would take farm products in storage and advance legal tender notes to the producer. He castigated the Alliance platforms in Kansas and Minnesota which included abolition of the Supreme Court, repudiation of debts, seizure of railroad property for the people, and revaluation of mortgages.⁷

When the elections in the fall of 1890 raised a surprising number of Alliance men to public office, both Federal and State, Godkin again used his pet

method of trying to laugh them out of court. He guffawed at the following dispatch from Kansas City: "J. A. McKay, the Farmers' Alliance candidate who was elected Judge of the judicial district composed of Barber and Comanche Counties, Kansas, never studied law, never was admitted to the bar, and never was in a court in any official capacity. His Alliance will send him to Ann Arbor to study law for sixty days and prepare himself for the bench." Godkin thought this was the prime joke of the year and asked how the Alliance could fail to expel McKay once he had become a lawyer. Sixty days might not make a lawyer out of him, but they would unmake him as a farmer and the Alliance wanted farmers in office. "Why 'poison' his mind with sixty days' study of what is sure to be bad for him as a promoter of public interests?" asked the editor.⁸ Later he returned to the absurdity of electing untrained men to office and wondered what would happen "after the Alliance fills up the bench in Kansas with men who have never studied law or anything else."⁹

The entrance of Alliance men into Congress gave Godkin a chance to poke fun at them with fertile ingenuity. He was disappointed that Senator William A. Peffer's maiden speech was not as wild as was expected because Peffer had only demanded the issuance of unlimited quantities of money. As Godkin saw the situation, Peffer was a fit representative of the Alliance movement because he was a demagogue who took up every new fad that came along. Once he had been a good Republican, but now an Alliance man who believed in free trade. "The particular craze which now dominates him is the notion that the Government ought to lend money to all comers at low rates of interest—presumably without security." Other Alliance adherents were pilloried in similar words. In this editorial Godkin concluded that any other kind of leader could hardly be expected because in the West the conditions were "very revolutionary."¹⁰

The Omaha Farmers' Alliance resolved "that the volume of the currency be increased to \$50 per capita." Godkin's comment upon this scheme was more virulent than usual. He explained its origin as follows: "A very large body of the farmers of that region are now really peasants fresh from Europe, with all the prejudices and all the liability to deception of their class." He added that

⁴ *Ibid.*, 50:192 (Mar. 6, 1890).

⁵ *Ibid.*, 211-212 (Mar. 13, 1890).

⁶ *Ibid.*, 269-270 (Apr. 3, 1890).

⁷ *Ibid.*, 51:84 (July 31, 1890).

⁸ *Ibid.*, 390 (Nov. 20, 1890).

⁹ *Ibid.*, 52:43 (Jan. 15, 1891).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 104 (Feb. 5, 1891).

"American intelligence" no longer applied "in any sense to large bodies of population in the Northwest"; and that no "enemy of democracy" had ever thought up a "grosser *reductio ad absurdum*" than a popular vote on how much money a nation should have.¹¹

In spite of Godkin's predictions that the movement would soon die, it took on a more national character with the organization of the People's Party at Cincinnati on May 21, 1891. Nevertheless he tried to prove that it was not really a national gathering because only 32 of the 44 States were represented; moreover, of the 1,418 delegates, 1,147 came from Kansas, Illinois, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, and Minnesota. The only prominent leaders present were Ignatius Donnelly and James B. Weaver, both of whom were "discredited" already. Godkin thought the declaration of principles was "no more original and captivating than its leading spirits." It was nothing more than the old Greenback platform in that it called for "plenty of money in the pockets of the people," endorsed the "absurd sub-treasury scheme," cried "death to the money power," and had little "popular magnetism." Godkin believed that every real issue had been omitted because there was no mention of the tariff or prohibition, both of which might have appealed to many people.¹²

In the same issue Godkin jubilantly described a visit by a delegation from the Cincinnati convention to Senator John G. Carlisle of Kentucky for the purpose of ascertaining his views. They asked him whether he favored government ownership of railroads and telegraphs. He inquired whether they intended to confiscate such property. No, they did not; that would be unfair because private property was inviolable. Did they intend to buy them for fourteen billions of dollars, an amount which was four times the debt of the late war? Were they willing to tax themselves for that immense sum? Were they ready to tax themselves to operate the properties, considering the fact that "the Government never yet succeeded in doing business at a profit?" These answers of Carlisle, said Godkin, "proved a powerful aid to reflection, and brought about a thoughtful silence among the delegates on this branch of their subject." The delegates then asserted that too much money was concentrated in too few hands. Carlisle thereupon

asked how they would remedy the situation. "Do you propose to say by your legislature that when a man has earned \$100 or \$1,000 or \$10,000 he shall not earn any more?" This, affirmed Godkin, stopped them, and they beat a hasty retreat. In his opinion it showed the good effect of the Socratic method on "those who are dominated . . . through a newspaper article or a speech."¹³

Godkin proceeded to philosophize at some length. He concluded that the episode proved that the American people were getting the European idea of government as a power distinct and separate from the population, possessing the means for all sorts of philanthropic schemes. What was needed, he averred, was a return to the New England town meeting. The colloquy between Carlisle and the delegation demonstrated the futility of the idea of "an imaginary division of the riches of the rich among the whole population." He added: "We think it would be found, could we get a peep into the brains of those who are most concerned about the concentration of 'the money power in too few hands,' that what fascinates each of them, in the prospect of a division of the funds of the Vanderbilts and Goulds and Rockefellers, is the notion that he will himself get a slice of the wealth that would make a permanent change in his condition." Proponents of such "socialistic" ideas forgot the smallness of the dividend each would get. Godkin maintained there was a function for capitalists in the present economic system: "They save for the whole community, so that when it wants to do something besides growing food, it can find resources ready for the purpose." He admitted that such capitalists are highly paid, but "their peculiar talent is very scarce." Moreover, "Of Socialist expectations, too, none is queerer than that rich men should be extraordinarily virtuous, and ashamed of their success, and eager to share with everybody who can prove his poverty." Godkin concluded his essay with the statement, "The poor in a democracy make the rich whatever they are."¹⁴

When the Populists did not do very well in the fall elections of 1891, Godkin was delighted to report that the movement had collapsed completely. He noted that even in Kansas Peffer had "gone over to the enemy, drinks champagne, and wears black broadcloth." The *Nation* thereupon preached a funeral oration for Populism in an editorial entitled "Crazes." Its thesis was that,

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*, 431 (May 28, 1891).

¹³ *Ibid.*, 434.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

ever since the Grange, promoters had succeeded in agitating certain portions of the people for a few years, but finally the fever always died down.¹⁵ In fact, during the winter of 1891-92, Godkin wrote piece after piece which proved that the agitation was dead.

The Populist convention at Omaha in July 1892 brought Godkin to see that he had been wrong. After admitting the large attendance and the enthusiasm of the convention, he wrote: "The dominant tone of the assembly was discontent with existing conditions. A large part of this discontent was the vague dissatisfaction which is always felt by the incompetent and lazy and 'shiftless' when they contemplate those who have got on better in the world. But there was also manifested that spirit of doubt as to the tendencies of our social development of late years which is shared by many thoughtful and philosophic observers, and which causes such observers to question whether something should not be done to check these tendencies." This statement was a fleeting gleam, one of the rare ones, which showed that Godkin could have understood the underlying issues had he chosen. However, he soon relapsed into the superficial satire and ridicule with which he usually commented upon farm unrest. He characterized the Populist platform as one which declared that "everybody could be made happy if the Government would print a vast quantity of paper currency, allow free coinage and foist light-weight silver dollars upon the country, establish an immense loaning agency, and take control of the railroads." The Populists conceived the Federal Government as "an institution of such omniscience and omnipotence, such a repository of wealth and wisdom, that it can be trusted with limitless power" or, to put it another way, that it "can make all its children 'healthy, wealthy, and wise.'" Godkin thought the presidential candidate, General Weaver, was the right type for such a party—a demagogue who had risen with Greenbackism, and "the sort of man who is always ready to take up with any new organization which can give him either office or prominence, and no platform could be constructed so ridiculous that he would not gladly stand upon it. He is the fit product of a convention in which Ignatius Donnelly was one of the most popular orators."¹⁶

After Cleveland's election, Godkin concluded

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 53:403 (Nov. 26, 1891).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 55:1 (July 7, 1892).

that the country had been made safe for sound money and tariff reform, and therefore he took up again his hobby of ridiculing the Western States that were controlled by Alliance and Populist men. Kansas was the horrible example which he pitilessly dissected; his shafts at its luckless farmers anticipated the diatribes of H. L. Mencken. Kansas unfortunately offered itself as a butt for Godkin's jokes because of an unseemly struggle between two rival bodies, each of which claimed to be the legal House of Representatives. When Lorenzo D. Lewelling was elected as the Populist Governor in 1892, he had carried with him the State Senate, but the lower House had a Republican majority. The minority Populists tried to organize the House so as to elect a United States Senator, and Lewelling had recognized them as the legal lower chamber. This group was making plans to impeach the State Supreme Court. With evil delight Godkin denounced the Populists without mercy. On January 19, 1893, he said: "The wildest doctrines are proclaimed amid the loudest applause, and almost any extreme of folly appears possible."¹⁷ Later he returned to the fray: "The situation in Kansas is a disgrace to an American commonwealth. The accounts from Topeka read more like the stories which used to come from Mexico before Mexico made her recent progress, than like statements of what could happen in a State of the Union. The blame for the scandal belongs to the Populists. . . . The only hope for the State is that the people will make their disgust so manifest that the Anarchists—for that is what the Populists have become—will be frightened into a backdown."¹⁸ Finally the Supreme Court decided in favor of the Republican House. Nevertheless, according to Godkin, the "queer Kansas Legislature" continued to act up by making all contracts payable in legal tender and by prohibiting the making of contracts in gold alone. Godkin called this downright "dishonesty": "We say dishonesty, because the whole course of Populist reasoning and action in Kansas has betokened rascality rather than ignorance."¹⁹ The acts of Kansas were simply "Western Socialism," he asserted in another issue.²⁰

Godkin delighted in poking fun at "Jerry" Simpson, who, he said, was heading "a grand agitation" among Kansas Populists to build a railroad owned

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 56:43 (Jan. 19, 1893).

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 134 (Feb. 23, 1893).

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 189 (Mar. 16, 1893).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 324 (May 4, 1893).

by the people. This was "the latest plan for the abolition of poverty and the deliverance of the people from the tyranny of the monopolists." It would supply "about fifteen hundred miles of daily fun," but Simpson never said where the capital was to come from because capital was "an accursed thing" to Populists.²¹

Godkin once said sorrowfully that Kansas was one of the leading States in literacy tests. It had a good school system, many colleges, a State university, few foreigners, and few cities and had always been considered a fair sample of an American commonwealth.²² Soon he was concluding "that demagogues may thrive and the doctrine of revolution be preached" in agrarian areas as well as in cities. When it was reported that the Governor of Kansas had ordered police commissioners not to enforce the law against vagrants, Godkin thought the Governor was "paying a warm tribute to the tramp as very likely a Diogenes or a Columbus in disguise." The result was that Kansas was filling up with hoboes from all over the West. "This sort of thing," he said, "is hard on . . . Kansas, but it is good for the rest of the country." He believed that the disturbances in Kansas proved that the two old parties were not the only ones that knew how to misgovern; nevertheless he ventured the opinion that the farmers of the State were getting their fill of Populism and were "lamenting that Gov. Lewelling is fastened upon the commonwealth for another year."²³ He chuckled with glee when, in the debate on the admission of Utah, Congressman Michael D. Harter of Ohio declared that no more States should be created until Kansas was civilized.²⁴

Coxey's army gave Godkin another chance to show up the weaknesses of Populism. He declared that the Coxeyites were Populists "of the lowest grade, mobilized, so to speak, for active service."²⁵ When the armies reached East St. Louis, said Godkin, "These 'sojers' had the bad luck to receive an offer of \$1.50 per day to work at digging trenches for the laying of pipe for the East St. Louis Water Board." They refused to work and so the people of the city stopped feeding them. According to Godkin, Jacob Coxey was a horse dealer "when not marshalling his hosts." Coxey had recently

gone to Chicago to sell some horses, and upon receiving only \$145 for a \$1,000 horse, he "blamed the Government for it" because of the shortage of money. Coxey's program, as explained by Godkin, was to have the Government issue five hundred millions of paper money to be given pro rata to the States in the amount of twenty millions a year. The editor thought Coxey figured that horses would then bring better prices and added that Coxey was too blind to see that the low prices for horses were caused by trolleys and cable cars. In another article in the same issue, the Coxey affair was called "Vagabonds' Disease," the same kind of malady which infected the young Parisian dynamiter named Henry who had thrown a bomb into the French Chamber of Deputies. Godkin commented that a certain Dr. Raynaud prescribed baths and tonic for this disease. Speaking of the industrial armies, Godkin said: "A literal bath would no doubt have its terrors for them, but what they need is the cold douche of strict police supervision, of the application of the laws against tramps, of the refusal of food without work for it."²⁶

Godkin described the armies of Coxey and Frye as "disgraceful" because of their laziness, and as a gang of "ragamuffins" who passed farms that were badly in need of labor, and yet who sponged off the farmers.²⁷ "What the army wants is bacon, whiskey, hominy, pie and the like, without working for them. . . ."²⁸ The railroads were castigated for permitting these "tramps and criminals" to steal trains. Godkin maintained they should be arrested and handled just as if they were members of the Jesse James gang.²⁹ His explanation of "the poison of Coxeyism" was the high tariff policy of the Republicans since 1865. "Protection leads straight to socialism, of which Coxeyism is simply a filthy eruption."³⁰

The above summary is a sampling of Godkin's reactions to the Alliance movement from its beginning until about the time Populism merged with the Democratic Party. From the vantage point of half a century later, how does his analysis hold up? The answer is: Rather poorly. Afterwisdom is of course easy, but it is the only tool the

²¹ *Ibid.*, 378 (May 25, 1893).

²² *Ibid.*, 44 (Jan. 19, 1893).

²³ *Ibid.*, 57:440 (Dec. 14, 1893).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 458 (Dec. 21, 1893).

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 58:358 (May 17, 1894).

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 264, 266 (Apr. 12, 1894).

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 282 (Apr. 19, 1894).

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 306 (Apr. 26, 1894).

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 340 (May 10, 1894).

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 358 (May 17, 1894).

historian has at hand for judging the validity of statements made in the past.

The first impression gained from a perusal of Godkin's editorials is that they are superficial. Nowhere does the editor show any realization that the farmers faced the hard facts of overproduction, loss of markets, and low prices. Granted that the farmers as a group were largely if not totally responsible for overproduction, one is still constrained to say that they were held in the iron grip of circumstance—no matter who was to blame—and that, when corn was used as fuel because it could not be sold, Godkin's slick thrusts of satire sound artificial. His facile suggestion that the lazy farmers get down to work and forget agitation does not meet the issue at all. Indeed it could be argued that the farmers had worked too hard; that is, they had produced too much and prices would have been higher if they had worked less and produced less. Such a statement is also artificial, but no more so than Godkin's. It is ever the custom of unfriendly critics of the farmer to say that he is shiftless and that if he spent more time working than talking he would be better off. It was heard after 1929 in reference both to farmers and laborers. Surely there are lazy farmers, but to explain the troubles of a whole class of people in such terms is not only cruel but untruthful.

Godkin's unsympathetic shafts at the ignorant "hicks" who fell for all kinds of crazes is not even original.³¹ Indeed, he proved its unreliability when he admitted that Kansas had good schools and colleges as well as a high level of intelligence. Poking fun at the backwoods, untraveled, gullible countryman is part of the American folklore; possibly at times it may be justified, but it does not help to explain the problems involved in this case. The unlettered farmers who supported Jackson were pilloried by New England Brahmins; again, after the Civil War, those who listened to Greenback ideas were criticized as ignoramuses. In the 1920s H. L. Mencken made himself famous by describing the farmer as a boorish muzhik who slept in his underwear. Even today the gullible

"hayseed" who buys the Brooklyn Bridge for a nickel is part of the stock in trade of "superior" urban jokesters. In short, Godkin's diatribes against the farmer on that score fall of their own weight as a serious analysis of what was ailing the West.

Moreover, the use of foreign ideas like socialism and anarchism as a formula to explain the "follies" of the farmers is equally unacceptable. Godkin weakened that approach by admitting that Kansans, at least, were predominantly native. Here again he was falling into the easy error of blaming foreigners, or foreign influence, or foreign ideas—an error which was common both before and after his time. Benjamin Franklin feared that colonial Pennsylvania would be Germanized; Federalists were afraid of the influence of alien editors; the Native Americans objected to foreigners, particularly Catholics; the Democratic demand for a lower tariff in the 1880s was said to have been financed by British gold; Al Smith, if elected in 1928, would bring the Pope to the United States; and in 1936 Smith called Franklin D. Roosevelt a communist. The "line" is as old as the Republic, but it seldom, if ever, is valid. In any event, Godkin was not being very profound when he attributed Western radicalism to foreign influence. A recent article shows that Western radicalism was preponderantly native, owing little to the influx of foreign ideologies.³²

Godkin's assertion that the farmers were looking to the Government as a sort of Santa Claus who would make everyone healthy, wealthy, and wise

³² Chester McArthur Destler, "Western Radicalism, 1865-1901: Concepts and Origins," *ibid.*, 31:335-368 (December 1944). In this able essay the cooperative movement is mentioned as the only idea that showed indisputable borrowing from abroad by American radicals of the period. James C. Malin, "The Farmers' Alliance Subtreasury Plan and European Precedents," *ibid.*, 31:255-260 (September 1944), suggests that the subtreasury scheme might have owed something to foreign thinking. However, Destler had shown in "The Influence of Edward Kellogg upon American Radicalism, 1865-96," *Journal of Political Economy*, 40:338-365 (June 1932), that C. W. Macune was careful to justify his scheme for crop loans in terms of the accepted monetary and interest theories of Edward Kellogg. Destler believes that Malin missed this fact and calls attention to it in his appraisal of Malin's article in *The United States, 1865-1900*, edited by Curtis Wiswell Garrison, 3:61-62 (Fremont, Ohio, 1945).

³¹ Compare Benton H. Wilcox, "An Historical Definition of Northwestern Radicalism," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 26:394 (December 1939), which disproves "the older picture of sockless, hell-raising frontiersmen, grasping frantically at every crack-pot panacea offered them by self-styled messiahs who promised to lead the mortgage-ridden farmer out of bondage into a freer, happier land."

by dividing up property or by giving everybody something for nothing, leaves the historian cold. It is hardly necessary to remind the present generation that this cliché was repeated *ad nauseam* by Liberty Leaguers and other opponents of the New Deal during the 1930s. One can easily grant that there were some farmers in the 1890s and some boondogglers in the 1930s who were perfectly willing to live off the Government, but as a pattern to explain unemployment, low prices for farm products, and hard times, such a formula is entirely inadequate. Godkin was not fair to the Populists when he accused them of wanting government largess, but even if they had been desirous of a free handout they would have been appealing to good old American tradition. "Getting something for nothing" from or through the Government is at least as old as the protective tariff.³³ The high tariff can be objected to on many counts, and yet the magnificent achievements in building up American industry are at least in part the result of the tariff. It was a case of one section of the American economy getting something for nothing, but in the end the whole country was strengthened. Godkin's remarks about Coxey's scheme to have the Government divide paper money among the States at the rate of twenty millions a year are not only inaccurate;³⁴ they are a *l'ou* rather amusing in consideration of the way in which the Federal surplus was donated to the States in the 1830s. Each State got something for nothing, and yet the policy was not considered to be un-American. The same can be said about the Homestead Act³⁵ the

Land-Grant College Act, and the benefactions to the transcontinental railroads. All three involved governmental largess. But how long would it have taken to settle the West without the offer of a free farm and to bind the Far West to the East with bands of steel without the gift of millions of acres of land to the railroads? Where would many State universities be today without the grants of land to get them started? In short, the criticisms by Godkin, as well as by the anti-New Dealers, about getting something for nothing, are unrealistic, to say the least. If one wished to be a propagandist, he might easily show that, to a considerable degree, the greatness of the United States can be attributed to free handouts either in the form of the tariff, farms, or land to railroads and colleges. The point is not whether the recipient gets something for nothing; it is rather whether the free handout accrues to the benefit of the people as a whole.

In his comments upon specific portions of the Populist program, Godkin showed little comprehension of the fundamental issues. He castigated, as "peasants fresh from Europe," those who would tinker with the currency by increasing the coinage of silver. Free coinage would not have offered a solution of the farmer's dilemma. That much is obvious. But Godkin did not perceive that there were certain underlying factors that made the inflationary drive understandable. There is no evidence in his editorials that he saw that the world's gold supply had been decreasing while business and population had been increasing, that more money was needed for the purposes of circulation, and that moderate inflation might have eased the farmer's plight somewhat at least. Instead, he chose to call the demand for more coinage simple dishonesty and rascality. Nevertheless, only a few years later, conservative business interests themselves concluded that the supply of currency was short and in principle proceeded to accomplish, temporarily in the Aldrich-Vreeland Act and per-

The Crisis of a Frontierless Democracy, 170-171 (New York, 1937), called the public domain "the original relief fund of the United States, and by far the greatest that the country has had. . . [When] The Homestead Act was adopted. . . the government still had half of the national domain (half of the present United States) to use as a relief fund." See also Aubrey Williams, "The Government's Responsibility for Youth," *American Academy of Political and Social Science, Annals*, 194:125 (November 1937): "The Federal Works Program is . . . the modern substitute for land grants . . ."

³³ Thus the tariff is called "a *dole de luxe*" by Frank A. Fetter in Leverett S. Lyon and Victor Abramson *Government and Economic Life*, 2:610 (Washington 1940).

³⁴ Godkin's scathing comments on Coxey sound ludicrous when compared to the analysis in Donald L. McMurry, *Coxey's Army: A Study of the Industrial Army Movement of 1894* (Boston, 1929). Historians have considerably revised contemporary opinions about Coxey, especially since, as Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Commager say, some of the program of F. D. Roosevelt was not unlike Coxey's; see their *The Growth of the American Republic*, 2:254-255 (New York, 1942). Another character who was lambasted by Godkin and who has been reinterpreted is Altgeld. See Harry Barnard, "Eagle Forgotten": *The Life of John Peter Altgeld* (Indianapolis, 1938); and Harvey Wish, "John Peter Altgeld and the Background of the Campaign of 1896," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 24:503-518 (March 1938).

³⁵ Walter Prescott Webb, in *Divided We Stand*:

manently in the Federal Reserve Act,³⁶ what Godkin had condemned as un-American. When the farmer said money was "tight," he was likely to be called a socialist; when industrialists found money to be "tight," something was done about it.

It is an interesting commentary upon the perverse logic of history that much of what Godkin and the conservatives denounced in the 1890s became a reality later, particularly in the 1930s. Speaking of the monetary policy of the New Deal, a recent textbook states that the "inspiration came from the spirits of James B. Weaver and William Jennings Bryan."³⁷ In 1933 the President secured the power to inflate the currency with three billions of treasury notes, and under laws passed in 1933, 1934, and 1939, the Government began the policy of purchasing silver. The dollar was devalued to about fifty-nine cents in 1934. Furthermore, Godkin called the subtreasury scheme a childish idea; but the principle of lending money to farmers on their crops was later instituted in 1916 and 1923. Godkin said any reduction of, or moratorium on, farm mortgages was dishonest; nevertheless, a stay law was enacted in 1935 which withstood the scrutiny of the Supreme Court. These various measures to aid the farmer produced neither the catastrophe that Godkin had predicted for such a policy nor the marvelous results that proponents promised. The moral is obvious.

The trouble with Godkin was that he was an old liberal who found himself out of place and unable to understand the meaning of the new industrial world that had emerged since the Civil War. He failed to perceive the dangers in concentration of wealth, monopolies, and trusts. As a Mugwump, he thought only in terms of cleaner government and lower tariffs. Indeed, the only solution he had to offer was tariff reform, and he stultified this suggestion by linking the tariff with socialism. There is little doubt that the farmer was being victimized by the high tariff, but the belief that agricultural radicalism could be ended by the magic key of tariff reform was naive. Not understanding what was bothering the farmer, Godkin took the course of satire and calling names.

Granted that Godkin completely missed the significance of the farm problem what of the far-

mer? He was certainly not blameless in causing his own plight. However, he knew some things which Godkin in New York City never comprehended. He knew that the bottom had dropped out of his market, that prices were too low, that he could not service his mortgage, and that he was in danger of being foreclosed. Doubtless many farmers had unwisely mortgaged their property; others had probably bought more consumer goods than they could pay for; and all were overproducing so far as the buying power of the rest of the people was concerned. Moreover, the Populists, composed of men who were more adept at agriculture than at statecraft, tried to do things that invited the kind of criticism which opponents like Godkin were past masters at giving. Threats to impeach state supreme court judges, internal strife within Populist legislatures, and building people's railroads were clumsy, even foolish. They deserved criticism, but Godkin never saw that these were symptoms of deeper causes.

The farmer found himself in a disadvantageous position *vis-à-vis* the new and powerful industrial order. Confronted by concentration of wealth and money power, he perceived in a blind fumbling sort of way that he was being neglected and even victimized. "Somehow, it was felt (though none too clearly perceived in its logical implications), democratic government had failed to control the forces of exploitation engendered by the new industrialism."³⁸ Indeed, ever since the close of the war, device after device had been suggested for the protection of agriculture, to little avail; the Ohio Idea and the Grange were examples. These controls gained slight permanent advantage for the farmer because they were immature and unrealistic.³⁹

There are two outstanding impressions derived from a study of farm problems after the Civil War: the farmer was helpless under the crushing burden of surpluses; and he never learned that in economic

³⁶ Leon W. Fuller, "Colorado's Revolt against Capitalism," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 21:351 (December 1934).

³⁷ This idea is expanded in William A. Russ, Jr., "The Price Paid for Disfranchising Southerners in 1867," *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 44:36 (January 1945). As an instance of unrealistic fumbling methods, see Arthur H. Hirsch, "Efforts of the Grange in the Middle West to Control the Price of Farm Machinery, 1870-1880," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 15:473-496 (March 1929), which describes the futile fight of the Grange against the middleman.

³⁸ Compare Jeanette P. and Roy F. Nichols, *The Republic of the United States: A History*, 2:330,355 (New York, 1942).

³⁹ Morison and Commager, *The Growth of the American Republic*, 2:594.

unity there is strength. Industry had set the example of such unity by the creation of trusts and monopolies, which, by the way, the Populists fought bitterly. Labor was learning the lesson and ultimately would unite to such a degree as to be, in the eyes of some, a menace. The farmer, on the other hand, never perceived that if industry and labor concentrated their might for their own protection, he must do likewise or progressively be reduced in his capacity to compete with them. The farmer did not think in terms of economic unity because by his very nature he was an individualist who believed that, as an independent entrepreneur, he could stand alone. To be sure, he periodically joined up with movements that were predominantly political—Godkin called them crazes—but these soon fell apart. What the farmer needed was some sort of strong, permanent, economic organization which could exert for him the same self-protective power that industry gained by means of concentration and that labor was developing by means of unionization. Such action would have meant loss by the farmer of some of his independence and individualism, a price he refused to pay. In other words, voluntary cooperation to restrict production was impossible; at least when tried it failed.⁴⁰ On the other hand, when stockpiles of manufactured products became too large and prices began to sag, industry ceased production or at least reduced output. When farm prices went down, all farmers quite likely produced even more than before, and so the vicious spiral was magnified.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Compare Theodore Saloutos, "The American Society of Equity in Kentucky: A Recent Attempt in Agrarian Reform," *Journal of Southern History*, 5:347-363 (August 1939). This movement sought to raise the price of tobacco by decreasing the crop. "One of the most discouraging obstacles was the independent farmer who asserted his independence by refusing to join the association."—p. 355.

⁴¹ If voluntary restriction does not appear to be feasible, it would seem to be reasonable that the end should be accomplished by governmental supervision. At this point the peculiar nature of the farmer again emerges to bedevil him. He is an individualist and does not want "brain trusters" telling him how many acres to plant. If he is told how many to plant, he votes against his friends, as he did in 1940 when the Willkie strength was mainly in the farm belt.

Of course the statement that the farmer was told how many acres to plant is not accurate, but in such form it made excellent political propaganda. In the original AAA program the farmer agreed by contract to

Doubtless the farm problem will always exist for many reasons besides the farmer's individualism and helplessness under surpluses. There are conditions over which the farmer has little if any control. For instance, if urban workers are unemployed, the farmer loses his market. If the world market is surfeited, the farmer soon suffers. William E. Dodd used to say that agriculture in the United States has been prosperous only during wars when demand overtakes supply. But during a war the farmer is urged to bring more land into cultivation; when the conflict is over and the market slumps, he has more productive capacity than ever, and is likely to be stuck with a mortgage besides.

Furthermore, as Avery O. Craven has said: "It is probably a fact that little wealth has ever been acquired from American agriculture except that which has come from exploiting the natural fertility of the soil and from the so-called 'unearned increment' which has arisen from the constantly increasing values of land. And there is no reason to hope, unless decided changes come, that, with the ending of these two sources of profit, the American farmer will not follow the course of farmers in all lands, in all periods of time, and accept the status of a peasant as his lot."⁴² Everett E. Edwards has asked: "Is it not conceivable that detailed and discerning studies of the effects of mechanization would indicate the undesirability, economically and sociologically, of attempting to preserve the traditional family-sized farm and the

reduce acreage for which he was paid benefits; in the AAA program of 1938 acreage was to be fixed only by agreement of two-thirds of the farmers involved.

⁴² "The Agricultural Reformers of the Ante-Bellum South," *American Historical Review*, 33:304 (January 1928). The same conclusion, arrived at from a different direction, had been reached earlier by Joseph Schafer in his "Historic Ideals in Recent Politics," *American Historical Association, Annual Report*, 1916, 1:466 (Washington, 1919). He argued that the end of free land removed an influence which "regulated the value of privately-owned land and kept it within easy reach of the industrious farmer who wished to buy and pay for his farm out of the savings of a few years rather than go West. Henceforth it appears there is no regulator of farm values save the subsistence requirement of an agricultural peasantry who will in most cases lease (not own) the lands and pay all the balance over and above subsistence in the form of rent. No doubt this sounds pessimistic, but the tendency obviously is to approximate European conditions."

general lay-out of the rural community that is associated with it?"⁴³

These statements are probably unduly pessimistic, particularly in the light of Richard H. Shryock's studies, which prove that with proper methods of conservation and care—such as the Pennsylvania-Germans have used—fertility can be preserved and the family-sized farm maintained, at least in the East.⁴⁴

In summary, there were certain basic factors, like

⁴³ "Middle Western Agricultural History as a Field of Research," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 24:323-324 (December 1937).

⁴⁴ "British versus German Traditions in Colonial Agriculture," *ibid.*, 26:39-54 (June 1939), and "Cultural Factors in the History of the South," *Journal of Southern History*, 5:333-346 (August 1939).

the farmer's innate individualism, exploitation of fertility, mechanization of agricultural methods, unstable markets, and the revolution from a dominantly agricultural economy to a dominantly industrial economy, of which Godkin never dreamed. These trends and facts produced problems that could not be met by the Godkin procedure of calling the farmer names and of telling him to quit loafing and grumbling. Again it should be said in Godkin's defense that afterwisdom is easy, that he was not alone in his attitude, and that even today there are many critics of the farmer who are no more clear-sighted than Godkin was. It would seem evident, nevertheless, that, as a guide to the farm movement of the late eighties and early nineties, the *Nation* must be used with extreme caution.

THE GENERAL RECORDS OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE IN THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

GUY A. LEE

The National Archives

The United States Department of Agriculture, established by an act of Congress approved on May 15, 1862, continued and expanded the agricultural activities carried on by the Patent Office from 1836 to 1862. It was headed by a Commissioner without cabinet rank until an act of February 9, 1889 made it an executive department under a Secretary.

For several decades the Department was engaged chiefly in the distribution of seeds and plants, scientific and educational work designed to increase agricultural production or decrease unit costs through scientifically approved cultural practices, the prevention of damage by disease and insects, and the selection of the best varieties and breeds of plants and animals. As the work of the Department expanded, numerous changes were made in its organization to provide for new functions, to bring together related scientific and economic work, and to coordinate various research, extension, and regulatory activities. In the twentieth century a relatively greater emphasis has been placed upon problems of marketing, production control, conservation, and rural living conditions.

The Secretary of Agriculture is responsible for formulating general policies, coordinating the work of the various bureaus, and administering the

affairs of the Department as a whole. The group of records created in the performance of these functions is here described.¹ It includes, besides the records of the Secretary, those of the Under Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, and staff assistants, and numerous special offices and committees created to investigate particular problems or to administer emergency functions. It also includes records of the "housekeeping," facilitating, and supervisory units of the Office of the Secretary, such as the Office of the Solicitor, the Office of Information, the Office of Budget and Finance, the Office of Personnel, the Office of Plant and Operations, and similar offices that have been discontinued. The records included in this group

¹ This article is essentially a summary of a *Preliminary Checklist of the Records of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture* compiled by Guy A. Lee, Max Levin, and Lois Bell Miller (Washington, National Archives, 1945) and of a manuscript checklist on records of the Solicitor's Office prepared by Lois Bell Miller. A statement similar to this summary will appear in a guide to the records in the National Archives, now being prepared.

The writer wishes to express his appreciation for the assistance given him by Theodore R. Schellenberg, Chief of the Division of Agriculture Department Archives.

are closely related to those of the various bureaus of the Department.²

The Agricultural Section of the Patent Office, 1839-1860. The agricultural work of the Federal Government was begun under the Department of State by the Commissioner of Patents, Henry L. Ellsworth, who in 1836 assumed responsibility for the distribution of seeds and plants obtained from consular officials and others abroad. After 1844 annual and special appropriations provided for the collection of statistics and general information on agriculture, for the distribution of seeds, and for special inquiries. The work was transferred in 1862 from the Patent office, which in 1849 had become part of the Department of the Interior, to the newly created Department of Agriculture.

The records (5 ft., 21 vols.) of the Agricultural Section of the Patent Office pertain mainly to the preparation and distribution of the annual reports of the Commissioner of Patents, which were issued as Senate and House documents, and to the collection and distribution of seeds and plants.³ The records pertaining to the annual reports include letters from farmers on crop prospects and agricultural practices, completed questionnaires, and copies of articles and essays, and letters concerning their preparation. The records on seed and plant distribution include reports from consular officials, foreign seed firms, missionaries, and others re-

garding varieties; requests from agricultural societies and farmers; and reports on the cultivation of seeds and plants that were distributed. The records of the Section also include letters and reports received on special inquiries, such as the study of European markets for cotton by John Claiborne, the study of native grasses by Increase A. Lapham, the collection of native grape cuttings by H. C. Williams, and the collection of tea seeds in China by Robert Fortune; and letters and reports on the work of the chemist, Charles T. Jackson, in analyzing corn cobs and Chinese sugarcane (sorghum), and of the entomologist, Townend Glover, in developing sprays for orange trees.

The correspondence of the Secretary of the Interior concerning the work of the Agricultural Section, 1849-62, is in the files of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior in the National Archives.

The Commissioner of Agriculture and the Secretary of Agriculture, 1882-1939. This subgroup of records (1,800 ft.) consists largely of (1) the Subject File of the Office of the Secretary, 1906/7-39, (2) Letters Sent by the Secretary, 1893-1939, and (3) the correspondent and subject indexes to these two files.⁴

⁴ The records of the Department of Agriculture while it was administered by the Commissioners from 1862 to 1889 are very incomplete. Practically none of the official records of the Commissioners are extant, though the gaps in the documentation of the activities of the Department are partially filled by the records of various bureaus, particularly those of Chemistry, Entomology, and Plant Industry. Investigators interested in the careers of the Commissioners must perforce use the scattered papers in the custody of various historical societies. Among such papers, the existence of which is known, are those of Commissioners Horace Capron (1867-71) and William G. LeDuc (1877-81). The private papers of Capron, which are in the custody of the Illinois State Historical Society, contain reviews and press notices of his work, commendatory mentions of exhibits, records of premiums, and correspondence with faculties of agricultural colleges, editors of farm journals, and officials of State agricultural departments and agricultural societies. The unpublished memoirs of Capron, portions of which were copied by the United States Department of Agriculture Library and were reproduced in the Illinois State Historical Society, *Journal*, 18:259-349 (1925), are in the possession of his grandson, Horace M. Capron, Evanston, Illinois. The private papers of LeDuc are in the custody of the Minnesota Historical Society, as is also an autobiography, of which a typewritten copy is in the United States Department of Agriculture Library.—T. R. Schellenberg.

² For the administrative history of the units whose records are described, see Lloyd Milton Short, *The Development of National Administrative Organization in the United States*, 374-394 (Baltimore, 1923); Charles H. Greathouse, "Historical Sketch of the U. S. Department of Agriculture," U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Division of Publications, *Bulletin* 3 (Washington, 1907); Francis G. Caffey, *A Brief Statutory History of the United States Department of Agriculture* (Washington, 1916); Edward Wiest, *Agricultural Organization in the United States* (Lexington, Ky., 1923); Carleton R. Ball, *Federal, State, and Local Administrative Relationships in Agriculture* (Berkeley, Calif., 1938); A. P. Chew, "The United States Department of Agriculture, Its Structure and Functions," U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, *Miscellaneous Publication* 88 (Washington, 1940; also 1930 and 1934 editions); U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, *The Yearbook of Agriculture 1940: Farmers in a Changing World*; and John M. Gaus and Leon O. Wolcott, *Public Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture* (Chicago, 1940).

³ All measurement figures are approximations of linear shelf space occupied by the records. Most of the papers are about demy letterhead size (8" x 10½").

In the Subject File the letters, memoranda, reports, and other papers received, together with copies of related outgoing material, are filed under the names of the hundreds of objects, commodities, events, transactions, and classes of actions of interest to the Department of Agriculture. The Subject File includes not only the correspondence of the Secretary but also a large proportion of that received or prepared by the Assistant and Under Secretaries; by property, fiscal, and personnel officers connected with the Office of the Secretary; and by special assistants and committees appointed by the Secretary.

The Letters Sent form a distinct and very nearly complete set of copies of all letters signed by the Secretary from 1893 through 1939. Many such letters were prepared by the bureaus of the Department, and the main file on any particular transaction may have remained in the records of the bureau most familiar with the subject or in the Subject File of the Office of the Secretary. The basic arrangement of the Letters Sent is according to bureau or office of origin.

There are three small series of letterpress volumes of copies of letters sent by the Commissioner and the Secretary prior to 1900. Four unlabeled volumes, 1879-85, contain fragmentary correspondence of the Commissioner concerning requests for seeds, publications, special reports, and information; 61 volumes, 1882-97, labeled Domestic Letters are of a similar nature; and 12 volumes, 1886-93, labeled Congressional Correspondence, pertain generally to requests of Congressmen for seeds, special reports, and positions for constituents. Each volume usually has a correspondent index. For the years prior to the initiation of the Subject File in 1906, the only incoming correspondence is a small partially indexed file (20 ft.) covering the years 1893-1906.

For the period covered, about 1893 to 1939, this correspondence is probably the best primary source of information on the relationship of the Federal Government to agriculture, and in hundreds of instances there are in it significant materials for the study of other phases of agriculture and public administration. Created at a high administrative level, many of these records concern policy, organization, and procedure, though they do not always contain the details of research or program execution. Such details may usually be found in the records of particular bureaus. In addition to the value derived from subject content, the reports,

letters, cross-reference sheets, and other papers in the General Correspondence subgroup serve as guides or indexes to the work of the Department and the records of other units of the Department.

The Assistant Secretary and Under Secretary of Agriculture, 1889-1940. The Office of Assistant Secretary was created by an act of February 9, 1889, to perform such duties as might be required by law or prescribed by the Secretary. The functions have usually not been precisely defined but have included various administrative and supervisory tasks delegated by the Secretaries. The Food Production Act of August 10, 1917 provided for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries to serve during the war. Authorization for the appointment of an Under Secretary, to serve as first assistant to the Secretary and to become Acting Secretary in his absence, was made in an appropriation act of March 26, 1934.

The records in this subgroup (26 ft.), except the letters sent by the Assistant Secretary, are small files pertaining to the special activities of several individuals and do not cover the entire work of the offices or even of the individuals. A large part of the correspondence of the Assistant and Under Secretaries is filed in the General Correspondence of the Secretary of Agriculture (see above), and some segregated correspondence for the additional Assistant Secretaries during the first World War is included in the records of the first World War (see below).

There is an orderly and complete chronological set of press copies of letters for the signature of the Assistant Secretary, 1889-1929 (119 vols.). Each volume has a correspondent index.

Records (8 in.) that were apparently assembled in the office of Frederick P. Bartlett, associated with Rexford G. Tugwell, include fragmentary correspondence and reports on field stations and offices, 1934-35; on the Florida Emergency Relief Administration, 1934; Indian land, 1934; industrial production, 1934; liquor control, 1933; peaches, 1934; Puerto Rico, 1933-35; and rural housing, 1934-35.

Another assistant, John F. Carter, was interested in developing plans for the agricultural rehabilitation of Puerto Rico (1934), was a member of the interdepartmental planning committee on the Upper Monongahela Valley (1934), and was a member of the Committee on Iron and Steel Products of the Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee. A small file (2 ft.) relates chiefly to these three activities of Carter.

Milburn L. Wilson was Assistant Secretary from 1934 to 1937 and Under Secretary from 1937 to 1940. The records, 1934-40 (3 ft.), include a set of copies of letters sent by Wilson and a subject file relating to his various activities and interests. Another small file, 1934-37 (2 ft.), is made up of the correspondence, memoranda, and reports of Roy F. Hendrickson and Donald C. Blaisdell as secretaries of a departmental committee on discussion groups that cooperated with land-grant colleges to test methods of handling community discussions of important national and international topics.

The Office of the Solicitor, 1904-1941. The Office of the Solicitor was established as the law office of the Department on July 1, 1905. The Solicitor and the attorneys of his office advise the Secretary and other administrative officers on legal problems that arise in connection with the Department's activities. He assists in the preparation of proposed laws, executive orders, and administrative rulings; and he interprets and gives legal opinions on these measures as need arises. He examines evidence to determine possible violation of laws or rulings of interest to the Department; he may hold hearings or act as counsel at hearings; and he may issue tentative findings, conclusions, and orders with respect to the various acts enforced by the Department. When the Department becomes involved in civil or criminal cases, the Solicitor prepares pleadings and briefs and cooperates with the Department of Justice in handling the cases. The Solicitor drafts and examines contracts, deeds, mortgages, leases, and other such legal documents; and he assists in securing patents on inventions of interest to the Department.

The records (1,900 ft.) of the Office of the Solicitor consist of (1) general correspondence files, 1904-30; (2) closed case files under the various acts enforced by the Department, 1904-41; (3) contracts, leases, and bonds, 1912-37; (4) patent case files arising out of the prosecution of patent applications for inventions made by the Department's employees or inventions thought to be of use in departmental work, 1909-32; (5) Agricultural Adjustment Administration legal files, 1933-37; and (6) other miscellaneous files.⁵

The correspondence files, which date from just

prior to the actual establishment of the Office, are concerned with its administration and with legal questions referred to the Solicitor for attention but not resulting in actual cases. Until 1912 the correspondence was filed under a numerical scheme for which a subject index is available. Thereafter the correspondence was arranged chronologically, and the only indexes remain in the custody of the Department of Agriculture.

The bulk of the Solicitor's records are made up of case files relating to the violation and alleged violation of the various acts enforced by the Department. The acts and the dates for which there are closed cases follow in alphabetical order: Animal Quarantine Act, 1908-38; Bird Reservation Trespass Act, 1914-39; Excess Wool Profits Act, 1920-35; Federal Caustic Poison Act, 1931-39; Food and Drug Act, 1907-40; Game Reserve Trespass Act, 1916-25; Grain Standards Act, 1918-32; Hunting and Fishing Trespass Act, 1918-22; Insecticide and Fungicide Act, 1910-33; Lacey Act, 1912-39; Meat Inspection Act, 1912-41; Migratory Bird Conservation Act, 1935-39; Migratory Bird Game Act, 1914-16; Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act, 1935-39; Migratory Bird Treaty Act, 1918-39; National Forest Laws, 1910-39; Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1931-39; Plant Quarantine Act, 1913-38; Produce Agency Act, 1928-39; Standard Container Act, 1918-32; Twenty-Eight Hour Law, 1907-41; Upper Mississippi Refuge Act, 1928-39; Virus Serum Toxin Act, 1914-26; and the Weeks Forestry Law, 1911-37.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration had its own Legal Division until about 1936 when the functions and records were taken over by the Solicitor's Office. The records, 1933-37 (70 ft.), consist of transcripts of hearings on adjustment programs and marketing agreements; exhibits presented at hearings; miscellaneous papers on hearings; transcripts of hearings, proceedings, orders, notices, memoranda, and correspondence arising out of investigations of license enforcement, 1933-34; a general numerical file pertaining to the Agricultural Adjustment Act and to specific cases arising under it; miscellaneous materials pertaining to the cases in the general numerical file; and indexes to the general numerical file.

The other miscellaneous files include records relating to enforcement activities of the Biological Survey, 1936-39; to contracts and litigation matters of the Forest Service, 1909-10; to investigations, 1913; to legal work for the Bureau of Public

⁵ Since the preparation of this article the National Archives has received additional general files of the Office of the Solicitor, 1900-37 (15 ft.) and records of the General Counsel of the Resettlement Administration, 1935-37 (25 ft.).

Roads, 1928-39, and the Weather Bureau, 1928-41; to land acquisition for the Biological Survey, 1930-39, the Mount Vernon Highway, 1929-34, the National Arboretum, 1925-35, and the Bureau of Plant Industry, 1934-35; to the Retirement Act, 1922; to the Perchon Society of America, 1910; to crop and seed loans, 1930-31; to the construction of departmental buildings, 1907-10; to naval stores legislation, 1914-26; and to national defense and food control, 1917-21.

Central Direction and Coordination of Scientific Work, Regulatory Work, and Land-Use Planning, 1897-1937. The staff work of planning, directing, and coordinating activities in these fields has been a major function of the Secretary's Office, but only occasionally have separate and distinct files (4 ft.) resulted from it. Other, and sometimes fuller, information is in the General Correspondence and in other records of the Department.

From 1921 to 1934 a Director of Scientific Work was to advise with the Secretary and bureau chiefs with regard to plans and project outlines and the correlation of scientific work. There are 12 letterpress volumes of copies of outgoing letters, 1920-29, of E. D. Ball and A. F. Woods, the only two persons to hold the office.

Earl N. Bressman, holding various offices and committee assignments, was an adviser to the Secretary on scientific matters in the 1930s. A file of his papers, 1933-37 (2 ft.), is made up of correspondence, memoranda, and reference material on Beltsville, chemurgy, emergency work relief, the Resettlement Administration, soils, sweetpotato starch, and other subjects.

Other fragmentary items are: a few copies of letters of Charles W. Dabney, special scientific agent, 1897;² the Sheldon Jackson papers on the agricultural possibilities of Alaska, 1897; and a manuscript volume by George Rommel on the utilization of farm products in industry, 1928.

The only separate file for the Director of Regulatory Work, 1923-33, is made up of letterpress copies of letters, 1923-29 (3 vols.), signed by Walter G. Campbell, the sole incumbent of the office.

In 1937 a Coordinator of Land-Use Planning was appointed to coordinate and stimulate land-use planning within the Department, including cooperation with operational agencies in developing practical land-use programs on a county or watershed basis. There is a small subject file, 1937 (8 in.), consisting largely of copies of letters sent by the Office.

Special Wartime Agricultural Activities, 1917-19. In April 1917, Secretary David F. Houston, appointed B. T. Galloway, a man of long and outstanding service in the Department, a special assistant and made him the representative of the Department on an Interdepartmental Advisory Committee. He was also chairman of an Interbureau Committee on National Defense and a member of a Committee on Food Supply and Prices. A file of memoranda, minutes, and letters, April 1917-March 1918 (4 ft.), arranged largely by names of correspondents, is concerned with Galloway's official committee duties. A small subject file, 1917 (9 in.), and press copies of letters sent (4 vols.) relate to offers of services, lands, and advice and to requests or applications for positions, information, loans, and cooperation.

There are press copies of letters sent by Assistant Secretaries and special assistants to the Secretary as follows: Clarence L. Ousley (13 vols.), E. B. Reid (1 vol.), Raymond A. Pearson (13 vols.), George I. Christie (3 vols.), M. R. Wilkinson (2 vols.), A. E. Taylor (1 vol.), Junius F. Cook (1 vol.), W. W. Mein and F. W. Brown (1 vol.), and A. H. Karr (1 vol.). These volumes relate to the various food and agricultural interests of the Federal Government in wartime and include information on publicity and education, food preservation and conservation, agricultural labor, farm machinery, and procuring and distributing nitrate of soda and other fertilizer.

The Division of Agriculture, Council of National Defense, 1940-41. When the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense was re-established in May 1940, a Farm Products Division, commonly known as the Division of Agriculture, was provided. As the defense program expanded, it was decentralized, and by Presidential letter of May 5, 1941, the work of the Division of Agriculture was transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture. The records (33 ft.) relate generally to agriculture, but it should be pointed out that other matters of interest to the entire membership of the Commission came before Commissioner Chester C. Davis and his deputy, J. B. Hutson, for their information and review, and, therefore, the material includes information on many phases of the early defense activity. There are files on industrial plant location and expansion, on financing of war production, on legislation, and on labor, prices, priorities, and a great variety of other subjects. As might be expected a large part

of the main file, a subject file, is arranged by commodities and concerns initial inquiries into possible requirements, plans for increased production, and steps toward conservation. Since the Division served as a center for information, planning, and coordination, there is a considerable amount of material on conferences and committees and on relationships with governmental and private organizations interested in agriculture.

Emergency Work Relief Records, 1933-43. Within the framework of the emergency relief legislation of the 1930s, the Department of Agriculture, through its bureaus, and often in cooperation with State agencies, sponsored hundreds of public work projects designed to relieve unemployment. At all times the Secretary and his immediate subordinates took an active part in the work relief programs, and the coordination of the Department projects was carried out in the office of the Secretary, chiefly by Fred P. Bartlett and Donald C. Blaisdell. The latter became chairman of the Emergency Projects Committee, established by memorandum of January 20, 1939. Shortly thereafter the Emergency Projects Section, to function as the executive staff of the Committee, was organized within the Office of Budget and Finance, and Paul P. Stewart became both the head of the Section and Executive Secretary of the Committee. The records (100 ft.), though not arranged in clearly defined series, consist of project papers assembled in order to gain approval for individual projects, reports, accounting and statistical records, serial releases and circulars, and general correspondence.

Civilian Conservation Corps Activities, 1933-42. More than three-fourths of all Civilian Conservation Corps camps were assigned to work projects under the technical supervision of bureaus of the Department of Agriculture, most of them under the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service. To Forest Service personnel the Secretary of Agriculture delegated a large part of the responsibility for liaison with the Office of the Director of the Corps and for coordinating and supervising the CCC work of the Department as a whole. It was not until July 27, 1938 that a distinct and separate unit, the Office of Civilian Conservation Corps Activities, was established to perform these functions, and even then there was no drastic change, since Fred Morrell, Chief of the Civilian Conservation Corps Division of the Forest Service, became head of the new office. It happens, therefore, that

there are in the Forest Service records a few papers that pertain to CCC activities that were departmental in scope. After about 1938 such papers were designated by a special file symbol, and beginning on July 24, 1939, all Department-wide materials were separately filed. These separately filed records, largely for the period 1939-42, consist of correspondence, memoranda, reports, and other papers arranged under the following subject headings: claims, communications, cooperation, disbursement, information, inspection, organization, personnel, publications, safety, supervision, and supply.

Conferences, Committees, and Boards, 1914-40. In 1914 a Joint Committee on Projects, made up of six persons representing the Department of Agriculture and agricultural colleges and experiment stations, was appointed to study the ways in which the work of the various agencies might be harmonized to the end of securing the most effective use of Federal, State, and other funds. The records of the Committee, 1914-15 (2 ft.), include minutes, classified lists of projects, reports on projects, and general correspondence.

In November 1924 the President called a conference of nine prominent agricultural leaders to undertake a thorough investigation of the agricultural situation and to make recommendations as to legislation and changes in administration. The records of the President's Agricultural Conference of 1924-25 (8 ft.) consist largely of the general correspondence of the conference secretary and a subject file relating to such matters as foreign competition, freight rates, quarantine laws, taxation, and tenant farming.

As a result of an unprecedented drought in the summer of 1930 the President appointed a National Drought Relief Committee to act as a central clearinghouse for the relief activities of the bureaus of the Department, the Farm Board, the Federal Farm Loan Bureau, the Federal Reserve Board, the Treasury Department, private bankers, railroads, the American Red Cross, and other agencies. The records, 1930-32 (11 ft.), largely copies of letters sent, were accumulated in the office of C. W. Warburton, Secretary of the Committee and Director of Extension Service. They include correspondence on certification of drought areas, freight-rate reduction, outright relief by Red Cross distribution of seeds and wheat made available by the Farm Board, feed loans, production loans, and regional agricultural credit corporations.

On January 2, 1940, the Secretary of Agriculture instructed the Office of Budget and Finance to make a survey of departmental and interdepartmental committee membership. Comstock Glaser and William A. Proctor carried out the project by means of questionnaires calling for the following data: authority and date of appointment, scope, functions, subject covered, personnel, activity, evaluation, and recommendations as to continuance or termination. The records, 1940 (2 ft.), consist primarily of the completed questionnaires and the related correspondence on the 476 committees covered. The final report and recommendation contains a detailed analysis and appraisal of committee work.

This subgroup also includes copies of the minutes of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, 1920-32 (2 in.), copies of about a dozen letters, 1917-19, signed by David F. Houston as chairman of the board, and copies of the minutes of the Federal Power Commission, 1923-30 (6 in.).

Office of the Chief Clerk, 1893-1931. Until about 1925 a great many of the auxiliary or facilitating services, such as matters of finance, property, communications, and personnel, were carried on by the Chief Clerk. The office became part of the Office of Personnel and Business Administration in 1925, and in 1931 it was discontinued and most of its remaining functions were taken over by the Division of Operation. The largest series of records is a set of press copies of letters sent, 1893-1929 (20 ft., 159 vols.), by the Chief Clerk's Office. Some of the letters were signed by the Secretary, the Director of Personnel and Business Administration, or the Chief Clerk in his capacity as a member of the Federal Real Estate Board. There are small fragmentary files as follows: Miscellaneous Papers, 1898-1906 (4 in.), Memoranda and Circular Letters, 1903-5 (less than 1 in.), Numerical Correspondence File, 1911-12 (1 ft.), Subject File, 1911-31 (4 ft.), and Memoranda, 1913-30 (1 ft.).

Fiscal and Property Records, 1914-40. These records (19 ft.) are largely copies of letters sent by the various units having supervision of fiscal and property matters (exclusive of buildings and real estate). The letters sent are for the following offices: Division of Accounts and Disbursements, 1914-29 (9 in., 6 vols.); Office of Inspection, 1914-25 (1 ft., 8 vols.); Office of Personnel and Business Administration, 1920-29 (3 ft., 23 vols.); Division of Purchase, Sales and Traffic, 1923-29 (4 ft., 27

vols.); Office of the Traffic Manager, 1922-25 (1 in., 1 vol.); and representative of the Department of Agriculture on the General Supply Committee, 1914-18 (1 ft., 5 vols.). The chief of the Division of Purchase, Sales, and Traffic served as the representative of the Department on the Federal Purchase and Specifications Board and on the Interdepartmental Board on Office Procedure.

Other files include copies of the pay rolls of the Office of the Secretary, 1914-23 (5 ft.); incomplete files of memoranda and circulars of the Office of Personnel and Business Administration, 1925-34 (4 in.) and of the Office of Budget and Finance, 1934-40 (4 in.); a subject file of the Director of Finance, 1935-37 (3 ft.); Orders (Bulletins) of the Chief Coordinator, 1921-28 (2 in.); and miscellaneous items assembled by L. O. Robbins of the Office of Personnel and Business Administration, 1922-34, and by the Division of Purchase, Sales, and Traffic, 1923-30.

Real Estate and Building Records, 1894-1942. Until 1925 housing and real-estate matters were handled largely by the Chief Clerk; during the next nine years they were encompassed in the Branch of Business Operation; in 1934 a Division of Operation was established; and in 1939 that was enlarged and the name changed to Office of Plant and Operations. At all times, however, major questions affecting the Department came before the Secretary, and he frequently delegated novel matters to special committees or his assistants. In the General Correspondence and in the records of the Office of the Chief Clerk there are data on building and real-estate operations, but in addition there are extensive separate groups of records (300 ft.). These, though arranged in a great number of small and poorly integrated groups, seem to provide reasonably full information about the housing of the Department in the twentieth century.

Most of the records fall into one or another of the following categories: (1) subject files relating to the construction of the new (administration) building, 1903-09, the construction and operation of the South Building, 1926-39, and the construction of the Beltsville Research Center, 1939-42; (2) numerous series arranged by building in which there is information on leases, space assignments, equipment, heating, alterations, etc., for each building, 1906-39; (3) files of leases and agreements, with indexes, 1895-1939; and (4) deeds, indentures, transcripts, abstracts, and related

papers covering title to lands acquired by the Department, 1912-43 (150 ft.). These title documents do not cover all lands acquired by the Department and are not generally related to housing; most of them cover Forest Service acquisitions. In addition there are many small miscellaneous files, usually pertaining to routine transactions but including correspondence and reports of the Department's representative on the Federal Real Estate Board, 1921-34 (3 ft.).

Personnel Records, 1905-40. From about 1891 to 1921 an Appointment Clerk in the Office of the Chief Clerk handled non-policy personnel matters. He was then known as the Chief Personnel Officer until 1925 when there was established in the Office of Personnel and Business Administration a Personnel Branch to take over his duties, those of the Salary Classification Office, those of the Personnel Section of the Office of Inspection, and certain new duties. In 1934 provision was made for a Director of Personnel who should report directly to the Secretary. The Secretary has usually taken a personal interest in personnel matters and has sometimes made special delegations of functions. The General Correspondence therefore has much relevant information.

The largest series of separately filed personnel records are the personnel folders of the Department's employees, 1862-1940 (500 ft.). These papers are the official documents on employment and status for all persons who were separated from the Department before 1920 and on many who have been separated since then. Other files relate

to discipline of employees, 1905-11; distribution of field employees, 1912; outside work, 1905-22; selective service, 1917-18; the Central Reclassification Committee, 1919-21; the Retirement Act of May 22, 1920; and various employee associations and clubs.

Other Records of the Office of the Secretary, 1882-1940. Many of the following small files and items, though they seem to be the accumulations of chance, are of great significance and interest: (1) a collection of loose, unfiled, and unanalyzed papers, including some on irrigation, on weather observation, and on Federal-State cooperation, 1882-1902 (18 in.); (2) copies of letters sent by the agent in charge of the Office of Irrigation Inquiry (Artesian Well Investigation), 1890-95 (10 vols.); (3) a manuscript volume (128 p.) giving a detailed account of the laws governing the work of each bureau and division, the general duties of each unit, the functions of each employee (usually named), and the disposition of funds, 1897; (4) copies of letters sent by Jeremiah M. Rusk, 1892, Henry C. Wallace, 1921-24, Howard M. Gore, 1924-25, William M. Jardine, 1925-27, and L. H. Goddard, 1923-24; (5) letters of congratulation to Henry A. Wallace, 1933; (6) appointment books of the Secretary, 1917-32; (7) a Marketing Agreements file, 1933-38 (8 ft.); (8) a set of *Federal Register* documents with related correspondence, 1936-39 (8 ft.); (9) an incomplete set of Orders, Memoranda, and Circulars of the Office of the Secretary, 1894-1940 (4 ft.); and (10) other minor files.

THE INFLUENCE OF WOODROW WILSON ON FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER

Edited by WENDELL H. STEPHENSON

Department of History, University of Kentucky

As the first World War drew to a close, William E. Dodd was engaged in writing *Woodrow Wilson and His Work*.¹ In preparing himself for that task, he read Wilson's publications, among them an article which appeared in the *Forum* of December 1893.² It revealed an unusually keen appreciation

for the influence of the West in American history, and it is not surprising that Dodd, who was unfamiliar with chronological detail in the development of Turner's concept of the frontier, should have concluded that Wilson "advanced the idea of the importance of the West in the shaping of American ideals and even in the making of the nation contemporaneously with" the Wisconsin historian.³ Wilson's contribution to the *Forum*

¹The letters and other sources used herein were assembled while the editor was on leave of absence from Louisiana State University with a research grant from the General Education Board, to whom thanks are gratefully acknowledged.

²Woodrow Wilson, "Mr. Goldwin Smith's 'Views' on Our Political History," *Forum*, 16:489-499 (1893).

³William E. Dodd to Frederick J. Turner, Oct. 3, 1919, in William E. Dodd Papers, in possession of Mrs. Alfred K. (Martha Dodd) Stern, Ridgefield, Conn.

was a review article on *The United States: An Outline of Political History, 1492-1871*, by an English writer, Goldwin Smith,⁴ who emphasized the traditional view of origins and saw "but two sets of forces to be reckoned with, the one set proceeding from New England, the other, which was in the long run to be discredited, from the South." To Wilson, the history of the United States was one of developments rather than of origins, but even if one considered, "the original elements," the States on the Middle Atlantic had "more claim to our choice than either New England or the South." He continued:

The formative period of American history has had no geographical limitations. It did not end in colonial times or on the Atlantic coast. It has not ended yet; nor will it end until we cease to have frontier communities and a young political life just accommodating itself to fixed institutions. Our heritage is much, our origin deeply significant, but most significant of all is the way in which we have traded with the estate we received at the first. That part of our history, therefore, which is most truly national is the history of the West. . . . It is this making of the nation in the great central basins of the continent that an outline history should principally exhibit.⁵

In one of his interviews with the President, Dodd inquired about his early concept of the West, but Wilson "promptly disclaimed all originality." The President told his visitor: "Turner and I were close friends. He talked with me a great deal about his idea. All I ever wrote on the subject came from him. No, it was in no sense a discovery of mine."⁶

Wilson's generous attitude prompted Dodd to pass on to Turner the President's tribute and at the same time to inquire if Turner recalled his student days at the Johns Hopkins University where Wilson gave annually a series of lectures. Turner replied in a manuscript letter of eighteen pages, setting forth his view of Wilson as president, their cordial relations at Hopkins, Wilson's contributions as a stimulating teacher and companion, and the origin of Turner's frontier thesis. In addition to

that general influence that comes from discussing an issue pro and con, he credited Wilson with contributing the word *hither* to his location of the frontier as "the hither side of free land."⁷

In recent publications, Fulmer Mood has made creditable contributions to an understanding of the origins of the Turner thesis,⁸ but it may be worth while to note the chronology of the concept and the influence of Wilson upon it as told in Turner's letter to Dodd.⁹

THE LETTER

7 Phillips Place
Cambridge Mass
October 7, 1919

My dear Professor Dodd:

I cannot thank you sufficiently for your kind letter coming at a time when we have both been saddened and alarmed over the news of the President's illness. He means so much to us as a *man*, as well as a wise and far sighted leader in the World, that the feeling is both personal and American, and human!

For myself I may say that there is no man who has been a more stimulating force in both matters of historical thinking and in public affairs than Mr. Wilson. It would be hard to overstate either his influence upon my general conceptions of history or of policies during the months of our intercourse at Johns Hopkins and later. I have both affection and admiration for him now as I had before he became one of the great figures of the World.

A few years ago one of my friends, Colonel J. A. Cole, U.S.A. retired, wrote me reminding me that even in those days of the later eighties I had written him that I shouldn't be surprised if Mr. Wilson became president of the nation. I had forgotten this; but if his memory is right, I must have been one of the early "Wilson" men.

And I am now warmly in favor of his policies. I cannot say that I have approved every part of

⁷ Turner to Dodd, Oct. 7, 1919, *ibid.*

⁸ Fulmer Mood, "Turner's Formative Period," in *The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner, With a List of All His Works*, 3-39 (Madison, Wis., 1938), "The Development of Frederick Jackson Turner as a Historical Thinker," in Colonial Society of Massachusetts, *Transactions*, 34:283-352, and "The Concept of the Frontier, 1871-1898: Comments on a Select List of Source Documents," in *Agricultural History*, 19:24-30 (1945).

⁹ Turner to Dodd, Oct. 7, 1919, in Dodd Papers.

⁴ Goldwin Smith served as professor of modern history at Oxford University, 1858-1866; migrated to the United States in 1868 to become professor of English and constitutional history at Cornell University; and later established residence at Toronto, Canada.

⁵ Wilson, "Mr. Goldwin Smith's 'Views,'" 494-497.

⁶ Dodd to Turner, Oct. 3, 1919, in Dodd Papers.

his course as president, for I hadn't his patience with Mexico, and believed that his course there encouraged German arrogance to us; nor did I think his *caution* in summoning German-Americans and all other Americans to rally around him in making an issue of American independence of German interference, was entirely justified. I believed that I understood the Middle West well enough to know that an adequate statement of the real conditions would win all its controlling elements to his support at an earlier period than he deemed prudent. But I can see, of course, that his delay strengthened his hand when finally he did raise the flag. The question was one of time simply and I did not attack, but rather tried to explain to those of my friends hereabouts who were almost as pro-British, or pro-French as they were pro-American in their criticism of him.

I have studied the situation enough also to see that no writers have yet adequately set forth the difficulties that confronted him, both in the Labor situation,—which but for his policies before the war would have been even more menacing—and in the control in Congress of Democratic leaders whom he had to overrule—men like [William J.] Bryan, [William J.] Stone, [Claude] Kitchin, Champ Clarke [*sic*], & the other leaders of the party & chairmen of committees whose tendencies were all away from the line marked out by President Wilson. Nor am I ignorant of the serious situation created by the opposition of Middle Western & some Pacific Coast Republicans, who came dangerously near to holding a balance which would have turned the scale if the President's following had broken. His management of that critical situation was masterly and needs more adequate recognition than can perhaps yet be given to it with the approval of the President. But the later historian will see it; and he will see the difficulties to be met in confronting European statesmen, changing conditions there, and here, as well.

What you say of sectional misrepresentation and partisanship is all true. It made it hard often for me to get on with my New England associates. They were never ready to concede that a Democrat was President, or that there were other sections to consider than this corner of the nation. I have risked my reputation for sanity as well as for judgment in supporting the President, even with some who have since been converted! Neither my health nor my abilities permitted me to take the public position which I would gladly have taken on some of these issues. A man from the West,

anyway, can hardly be of large public influence when he lives in a section that is accustomed to listening in preference to its own long established leaders. I have sometimes wondered during the war if I could not have been more useful in the West. But after an operation early in the War I was practically out of commission and on the edge of a complete break down, from which I hope I am at least partly recovered.

The future historian will find no difficulty I trust in estimating the men like Henry Cabot Lodge. But I ought to add that you would be surprised, perhaps, at the number of men in University and other circles here, who take the side of Mr Wilson.

As to the matter of the priority of the conception of the part of the western movement in the nation, it was indeed a fine and generous thing for the President to say what you quote in your letter. I am glad you consulted him before asking me.

Since you write me of your own conclusions prior to the interview with him, you may be interested in some of the chronology of the question. There never was any difference between President Wilson and myself about the matter, and his words to you would make it unnecessary for me to say more than to thank you for repeating them. But you will perhaps let me tell you rather ingenuously of the thing as it lies in my mind.

I think the ideas underlying my "Significance of the Frontier" would have been expressed in some form or other in any case.¹⁰ They were part of

¹⁰ In a second letter to Turner, Dodd wrote: "What you say about the new treatment of American history which must inevitably have come about. Yes and no: I wrote my Macon, or at least got the data first in order, in Goettingen and Leipzig; came back to North Carolina and put it into the form it now wears; and finally printed it in 1903. I came frequently upon the fact of the bitter rivalries of East and West and realized that it amounted almost to civil war at one time; but the distressing fact is that my Macon was not influenced appreciably by it. I was never brought into touch with an American historian till 1901 at the first Washington meeting I attended, although I attended the Association's meeting in 1900 at Detroit. Your influence began to count with me when I came to read your paper and devote special attention in my teaching to American history 1903 and 1904.

"Thus I might have gone on all my life without realizing the greatest fact in our history, stumbling all about it all the time. You see historical writing is so conventional; men write from inherited points

the growing American consciousness of itself. What I shall write of is rather the time and form of my own attempt to express them.

In a way the ideas were involved in the point of view which I presented in my *Fur Trade in Wisconsin*. When I read this to the seminary at Johns Hopkins (1888-89), Mr Wilson put new life into me by saying: "this is the kind of atmosphere in which we can breathe." His praise of the paper, which now seems not sufficiently warranted, heartened me to bolder attempts.¹¹

of view long after they think themselves wholly free; and in history, as in other lines of endeavor, men's minds are slow to see the whole significance of what they handle. Otherwise the race would long since have reached the ultimate knowledge. We grope and shall still be groping thousands of years hence. So, do not discount your own contribution by saying it must have been done about that time any how. At the same time you probably do say to your students—'Don't stop with my discovery.'"¹² Dodd to Turner, Oct. 14, 1919, *ibid.*

¹¹ On Feb. 15, 1889, Turner read before the Seminary in Historical and Political Science his paper on "The Influence of the Fur Trade in the North West from the Particular Standpoint of Wisconsin." Stephen B. Weeks served as secretary for the evening, but his minutes do not record any comment by Wilson, or any one else, on Turner's paper. Of the paper, he noted: "We can trace the growth of Wisconsin from the growth of the fur trade. It is only within the last fifty years that farming and manufacturing have become important. The early settlers found few hostile Indians, for the trader(s) had acted as missionaries of civilization. These Indians were, with two exceptions, of the Algonic stock, the pressure of the Iroquois of N. Y. and of the Sioux of the Mississippi tended to weld the separate tribes firmly together. There are three periods of the fur trade, the French, 1634-1763; the English, 1763-1816; the American, 1816-1834. By 1660 the French traders were firmly established. They preceded and did not follow the Jesuits. These traders led the forces of the Indians in the old French war. When the territory came into the hands of the English in 1763, they protected and aided the Indian. This put him on their side in the Revolution. These traders were allowed to remain after the British evacuation in 1794 and in 1812 we find nearly every one with an English commission. About 1809 John Jacob Astor formed by consolidations the South West Trading Company. It was reorganized after the war and all trade speedily passed into their hands. The methods of trade, quantity of goods sold and the influence of the trade on the Indian were also discussed." Johns Hopkins

In part the paper came from attempts of mine to apply to American history the mode of treatment that I had learned from Professor Wm F. Allen, in his courses on the evolution of society & institutions in the Middle Ages. There seemed to be a similarity in the problems that piqued my interest.

In part it was due to a reaction from a statement—loosely made—by Herbert Adams to the Hopkins seminary to the effect that the Hopkins men, having dealt with local institutional history in the United States, had thus explored the chief remaining opportunity for constructive work in American history & would next turn to European history for these topics—or words to that effect.¹²

My own mind was warmed and stirred by the change from my more or less provincial life in the West to a new environment, where I could get a more detached view of the significance of the West itself and where I was challenged, in a way, to try to account for myself and my people, under conditions of a new audience.

But all my ideas and ambitions were broadened and enriched by Woodrow Wilson's conversations, and—though less so—by his lectures, expounding *politics* in a larger sense, discussing the evolution of institutions and constitutions as "vehicles of life" as expressions of society and human beings rather than as formal and dead things. It kindled my imagination. His emphasis upon [Walter] Bagehot's idea of growth by "breaking the cake of custom" left a deep impression upon me when I came to consider what part the West had played. Mr Wilson didn't apply the idea to the West, but he kindled my imagination by the general idea.

These seeds were planted in the soil I have already described.

Moreover I got new ideas of the South and its dynamic side in my talks—sometimes my argu-

University Historical Seminary Records, 1877-92, pages 566-567 (Johns Hopkins University Library, Baltimore).

¹² No such statement by Herbert B. Adams appears in the Historical Seminary Records for Turner's year of residence, 1888-89. Occasionally the minutes of the meetings were rather full accounts of the proceedings; more often they were highly skeletonized. Charles Lee Smith served as secretary for the first meeting of the year, Oct. 5, 1888, and recorded in the minutes: "Dr. Adams briefly stated the objects and methods of the Seminary and the character of the studies undertaken under its auspices." *Ibid.*, 525.

ments with Mr Wilson. I came to see, by a process of give and take—the larger meaning of sectionalism as a movement between New England, Middle, Western and Southern sections, rather than between North and South. I dare to think that these conversations had some effect upon the later history of the country as well as upon Mr Wilson and myself. He was the older man and the riper scholar, and the greater mind. But I was bringing to him words from lands he didn't know, as he was giving me a new conception of the South, as well as a new outlook upon politics in general. But this is another story. We told each other that we were stimulated by these conversations over the right of secession, nullification, etc. And we talked of the power of leadership; of the untested power of the man of literary ability in the field of diplomacy; of the need of reconstructing legislative procedure [sic] to make executive leadership useful and effective.—he mentioned his ambition to get into political life, and his inability at the time to find the way here, as he could have found it under such conditions as those in England.¹³ Or rather Mr. Wilson talked of *these* things, and as I look back upon it he seemed to have set forth his own later programme. He even asked me what would happen if the German immigrants to the Middle West should sometime have to choose between Germany and the United States in case of war, & he seemed to doubt my confidence that they were assimilating so rapidly that there would be no real danger.

But to get back to the theme.

In 1892 in the student magazine of the University of Wisconsin, *The Aegis*, of November 1892 (VII. 48 [-52]) I printed an article on "Problems in American History"¹⁴ in which I outlined some of my ideas, and which I sent at the time to Mr. Wilson. As you will find this interesting, if you are interested in the evolution of my paper, I am

¹³ Turner wrote the sentence following the dash as an insert on the margin.

¹⁴ This article was reprinted in *The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner*, 71-83.

loaning you my copy which I will ask you to return when you have read it as I should not like to lose it from my family furniture. It was not written until 1892, and my residence in Hopkins was in 1888-89, (though I returned in 1890 for a week to take the examinations for my degree). It was therefore, in effect, the result of my consideration chiefly of what the western aspects of American history meant for me in my new chair. Mr. Wilson's splendid first chapter of his *Division and Reunion* appeared in March 1893. I see only his own vision in its appreciation of the West.

My *Aegis* article I also sent to other students. [Thomas P.] Moran gave me the copy I'm sending you some years ago, for example.

In 1893 I read at Chicago in *July* at the meeting of the American Historical Association there at that time my "Significance of the Frontier," not printed in the *Report* until 1894. But I also read it to the Wisconsin Historical Society in *Dec* 1893 & it was first issued by that Society in its *Proceedings*. Meanwhile I had read to Mr Wilson, who was a visitor, as I recall it, at my house,—though I am not at the moment sure where we met—the paper in manuscript, and he suggested the use of the word "*hither*" side of free land" for which I had been hunting!

In the Wisconsin printing of the paper I referred to Mr. Wilson's article in the *Forum Dec* 1893 (Wis. Hist. Society Proceedings for 1893) in a footnote as reinforcing the ideas presented in my paper (July, 1893)—which was printed as it was read in Chicago, except for "*hither*"

But the important missing link is my *Aegis* article of Nov 1892

I am more than glad that you have in hand the important work of portraying the President. He is an abiding figure, worthy of the best you or any man can put into such a work—May he be spared for further great service!

With renewed thanks

I am
Yours truly
Frederick J Turner

PEHR KALM'S OBSERVATIONS CONCERNING THE USEFULNESS OF
THE AMERICAN SO-CALLED COCKSPUR HAWTHORN
FOR QUICKSET HEDGES

ESTHER LOUISE LARSEN

I now have the honor to send to the Royal Scientific Academy the seeds of a tree which I predict with fair confidence should become one of the most useful in the husbandry of our native land.¹ The Swedes living in North America call this tree *Tupp-sporre Hagtorn*, and the English call it cockspur hawthorn.² In the *Species Plantarum* of Archiater and Knight von Linné, it is called *Crataegus coccinea*. For quickset hedges around fields, meadows, and vegetable gardens, a more useful tree could not be found. It requires a rather dry poor soil, and what is more important all branches and twigs are covered with long, rather strong, pointed thorns. No animal can risk forcing its way through such a hedge.

I am certain, if a pasture were enclosed by such a hedge and a high gate covered the entrance, sheep and cattle could safely roam night and day without a herdsman. Even if large numbers of wolves swarmed over surrounding fields each night, they could not possibly force their way into the pasture. There is not enough room anywhere to guide a hand through the hedge without immediately coming in contact with several terrible thorns. Yet this is not the tree's greatest attribute. The other, no less important, is that the cockspur hawthorn has the ability to withstand our winters as well as any of our native trees. This ability has been plainly proven during the past twenty-one years when some of our winters have been considered even colder than that of 1709. From my

account in the Åbo *Tidningar* for 1772, number 10, page 79, it can be seen how dreadfully cold some of these winters have been. Not only have Swedish and foreign trees planted in the vicinity of Åbo suffered because of the unusual cold but the native or Finnish trees have also been greatly damaged. This damage is discussed in my account in the Kongl. [Svenska] Vet[enskaps] Acad[emiens] *Handl[ingar]* for 1762 in an article on page 19 and another on page 129.³ In contrast, during the winter of 1760, an occasional cockspur hawthorn showed such slight injury at the extreme tips of the branches that it could hardly be considered noteworthy. This injury was probably due to the slim worms which were on these trees the previous summer. Other trees of the same stand were uninjured. See my discussion in the preceding citation in the *Handl[ingar]*, page 133. Since that time (1760) none of the cockspur hawthorns have suffered in the least from our severe winters. The cold during the month of February 1772 did not affect them as it had at the end of 1759 and the beginning of 1760.

As conclusive proof of what I said in the beginning, namely, that it would be difficult to find a more useful tree for quickset hedge than this cockspur hawthorn, the following information will serve. In my own orchard I have a quickset hedge of our Swedish hawthorn, *Crataegus Oxyacantha*, which I raised from seeds of berries collected from wild hawthorn here in the Finnish islands. As native plants they should be best adapted to our climate. In spite of this the plants froze to the ground in the severe winter of 1760 but sprouted new shoots from the roots imme-

³ Pehr Kalm, "Rön om den ovanliga källden under 1759 och 1760 års vinter, om dess verkan på träd och buskar uti och närmast omkring Åbo," Kongl. Svenska Vetenskaps Academiens, *Handlingar*, 22:19-141, 129-142 (1762). The titles of the two parts are different, and the one here used is from the index. Translated the title reads: "Observations concerning the Unusual Cold during the Winter of the Years 1759 and 1760, together with a Discussion of Its Effect on Trees and Shrubs at Åbo and the Surrounding Country."

¹ The article by Pehr Kalm which is here translated and edited by Esther Louise Larsen appeared under the title, "Rön, om den Amerikanska så kallade Tupp-sporre Hagtors nyttä til lefvande Häckar," in the Kongl. [Svenska] Vetenskaps Academiens, *Handlingar*, 34:343-349 (1773). For a list of the articles by Kalm which have been translated and published by Esther Louise Larsen, see *Agricultural History*, 17:172 (July 1943), 19:58 (January 1945). Mrs. Esther Larsen Doak's address is R. F. D. No. 4, Crown Point, Indiana.—Everett E. Edwards.

² *Crataegus Crus-galli* L. is the species commonly referred to as the cockspur hawthorn. It is considered the best of American hawthorns to plant in hedges.

diately so that two or three years later they had regained their original height. The plants froze and were killed from the new ends to the roots in the severe winter of 1772 and at present are sending out new shoots. In contrast the cockspur hawthorn was not injured in the least during that winter.

Should we not, therefore, value highly such a tree when we see daily how our forests pine away and we of the colder regions have no tree suitable for hedges around fields and meadows? I was so fortunate this year as to obtain an abundance of ripe berries and seeds from the tree. This autumn I sowed a quantity in the botanical gardens of the academy, the plantation at Sipsalo, in my own garden at Staden, and in the grove which I planted at the rectory in my sub-parish of St. Maria. I consider it my duty to send part of the seed of this useful tree to the Royal Scientific Academy for distribution to its members in order that they may plant the tree in several places in Sweden.

Like most American plants the cockspur hawthorn has difficulty in ripening its berries unless the summer is unusually long and warm. Last summer was definitely American, long and warm. The berries, therefore, ripened just as well as in America. Seeds should be planted and handled in the same manner as those of our Swedish hawthorn. They have the same wearisome nature as our Swedish hawthorn in that the seeds remain in the ground two years before they germinate. Thus if the seeds are planted this autumn they will not germinate until the month of June 1775. If sowing is delayed until next spring, a number of them will not germinate until June of 1776.

I have found it best to treat the seeds in the following fashion. As soon as the berries are ripe, I remove the seeds, place them on a table in a moderately warm room and dry them two or three days in order that they may be more easily separated from each other. When the seeds are removed from the berries, they are washed in clear cold water in order to separate them from each other for each berry contains three, four, or five seeds. Later, either in October or November, I make a bed two yards wide, of fairly good soil, in a dry place in the vegetable garden. The bed is divided lengthwise by means of a garden tape into five equally spaced rows. Along these rows I plant the seeds three fingers breadth apart and two deep. I then cover the holes with garden litter. I prefer planting the seeds to sowing them. The young plants are more readily located and more easily cultivated if the seeds are regularly spaced.

As soon as the bed is planted, I cover it with pine twigs which are allowed to remain there until the spring when the plants are expected to come up. The twigs may be placed on the bed the spring following planting. The first reason for keeping the twigs over the bed the entire time is as follows. The plants do not come up the first year, and the twigs keep the weeds from growing. If weeds were allowed to grow, one might, in destroying them, pull up some of the hawthorn seeds. Seeds lying exposed to the sun lose their power to germinate. Seeds cannot germinate and take root when they lie on top of the ground. Second: If a dry summer with a hot sun follows planting, the seeds which are not planted deeply will dry and burn, and a large number of them will lose their viability.

The spring I expect the plants to come up, I water the bed once or twice a week in case of drought. The litter is removed in April of the same spring. From now on methods used in caring for this hawthorn are the same as those used for the Swedish hawthorn. I should consider it wise to plant one or more of these seedlings in a sunny place in order to obtain ripe seeds. Seeds, as previously stated, do not ripen every year. The American and Swedish hawthorns do not ripen seeds during short cool summers in Åbo. In our provinces lying farther south I dare say seeds of the American as well as the Swedish hawthorn will ripen more often than here.

I still wish to add something concerning the attributes of the cockspur hawthorn. When in bloom it is quite pretty with large clusters of white flowers, but in autumn it is still prettier when it begins to display large berries of a beautiful red color. The meaty part of the berry surrounding the seeds is greedily eaten by geese. This substance tastes almost like rose hips and could be used for food in a similar manner.

In order that the members of the Royal Scientific Society may see with what weapons this hawthorn is armed, an illustration of an ordinary thorn, two times natural size, is shown on plate 11, figure 2.⁴ The larger branches often have thorns almost twice as long as these, with diameters proportional. It is often very difficult to gather the ripe berries which fall under the tree. One seldom returns without torn clothes. At least hat and wig remain hanging on some of the thorns of the tree. One should be more than careful of the eyes.

⁴ The illustration is a drawing of a thorn $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches long. It is the only part of the plant illustrated.

NEWS NOTES AND COMMENTS

G. DEBIEN'S COMMENTS ON THE "OBJECTIVES"

In a letter dated February 22, 1945, Mr. G. Debien of Cairo, Egypt, made the following comments on the statement of "Objectives for the Agricultural History Society during its Second Twenty-Five Years" that appeared in *Agricultural History*, 18: 187-192 (October 1944).

"I received with pleasure the October 1944 number and read in it your program-article with interest and careful attention. It is too bad that you very modestly have placed it at the end. Its place is at the beginning in large letters. I see by the opening passage you have great ambitions. Your aims are complex and concerned as much with geography as with history and as much with the present as with the past. That arises, no doubt, from the fact that your history is not so long as ours in Europe, is more directly accessible with the aid of description of the actual situation, and is more easily confused with geography.

"Your program, as is proper, is designed for the history of America and for Americans. But so many things in it are accepted by us that I am adopting it in text and spirit, making here only several observations and suggestions on two or three particular points.

"You have a very happy word—clearinghouse. It denotes a special willingness to cooperate, to serve as an intermediary. In what practical ways do you visualize the Society's fulfilling the function of intermediary? I know, at first glance, there is the journal which automatically plays this role. Is it sufficient for certain needs? For counseling, for mutual bibliographical help, for the loan of books and periodicals? What a beautiful future for the Society if it should chance to possess a large collection of books that could be sent on request of the members with a guarantee of deposit if necessary! Although it is a large city,

it seems to me from a distance, Washington is not a very central point which makes all research easy for the researcher. And it happens, I think in America as in Europe, that the friends of rural history are situated far from large libraries and would need for profitable work only some books, some periodicals, and some models.

"This leads me to ask you some questions. What is the extent of the library of the Society, its conditions of access, of loan? How is it increased? What are the general resources of the Society? Its relations with the American Government? Up to what point is its work primarily American? Does it consider extending the horizon to include the entire world, and in what way?

"Bravo for the dictionary of agricultural words, but [make it] a dictionary that explains at length each term and traces its history. One of several dictionaries? A purely American dictionary could be quickly drawn up.

"Historical atlases are very hard to do. They give me the impression of being works of conclusion.

"If I had the leisure for it, I would dream of writing some guides for the preparation of good monographs on agricultural estates: estates before the agricultural revolution, modern estates, sugar, coffee, and indigo plantations of the 18th century. But, without doubt, the best guides here are simply the best monographs and some general bibliographies of the quality of those that you have published.

"In any case whatever forms your works of mutual historical aid may take, they will be as welcome as a hand that grasps a drowning man. I only wish that you would think sometimes of the European workers who surely have the same needs as the American investigators, and that you would think of specifying by what means you could come to their aid."—Translated from the French by Helen L. Eddy.

is not
easy for
America
ory are
eed for
odicals

What is
ditions
are the
as with
oint is
der ex
and in

words
h each
diction-
quickly

ey give
sion.

writing
graphs
gricul-
coffee.

But
ly the
raphies
d.

mutua
ome as
h tha
orker
merica
cifying
Trans-